

116

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRWP-9002-2021

Date of Decision: 05.10.2021

Muskanpreet Kaur and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Rajeev K. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Articles 226 Constitution of India, petitioners have prayed for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty, as they solemnized marriage on 15.09.2021 against the wishes of private respondents No.4 and 5.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners are major, who fell in love with each other and decided to marry and when the love affair of the petitioners came to the knowledge of the parents of petitioner No.1 (respondent Nos.4 and 5), they opposed it, as they wanted to preform the marriage of petitioner No.1 with a boy of their own choice. As a result of that, the petitioners performed marriage on 15.09.2021 as per Sikh rites and ceremonies at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Dasvin, Village Singha Devi, Tehsil Kharar, District Mohali. According to him, the petitioners are receiving threats from them, as they have solemnized marriage against their wishes. He submits that there is every likelihood that the private respondents No.4 and 5 would implicate the petitioners in some false case by giving a complaint to the police. He

has invited the attention of the Court to the representation dated 15.09.2021 (Annexure P-5) and contended that till date, no protection has been provided and further prays for issuance of necessary directions.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the averments contained in the petition lack material particulars and do not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension that private respondents No.4 and 5 may falsely implicate them in some criminal case, but in the considered opinion of this Court, this apprehension is misplaced, as admittedly, no complaint has been made so far against them by private respondents No.4 and 5.

Apart from above, even, if it is assumed, that a complaint is given to the police by any of the private respondent against the petitioners, then it cannot be construed as threat to their life and liberty, as private respondent is also free to avail his remedy in law in case, he feels that some offence has been committed against him.

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

05.10.2021

Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes No
Yes No