

123

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-9200-2021

Date of Decision: 24.09.2021

SONU AND ANR

.. Petitioners

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. L.S. Lakhanpal, Advocate for
Mr. Amritpal Singh Sohal, 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.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty, as they solemnized marriage on 20.09.2021 against the wishes of private respondents No.4 to 8.

Briefly, the facts pleaded in the writ petition are that the petitioners are major, who knew each other for the last about two years and decided to marry against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 to 8. When the love affair of the petitioners came to the knowledge of the private respondents, they opposed it, as they wanted to preform the marriage of Jyoti Bala (petitioner No.2) with a boy of their own choice. As a result of that, the petitioners performed marriage on 20.09.2021 as per Sikh rites and rituals at Gurudwara Amar Shaheed Baba Jeewan Singh Ji, Amritsar. After their marriage, the petitioners are receiving serious threats to their life and liberty from private respondents (father, brothers and uncle of petitioner

No.2) and in this regard, petitioners submitted a representation dated 20.09.2021 (Annexure P-4) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Sri Muktsar Sahib. It is prayed that the petitioners be provided protection.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the affair of the petitioners was opposed by the private respondents and there were compelling circumstances for them to perform the marriage against their wishes. He submits that there is every likelihood that the private respondents 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 20.09.2021 (Annexure P-4) and contended that till date, no protection has been provided and further prays for issuance of necessary directions.

After hearing the learned counsel, this Court finds that the averments contained in the petition do not contain material particulars, much less the alleged manner and mode of threat extended to the petitioners. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension that the private respondents 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 the private respondents.

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

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for

exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

24.09.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No