

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

CRWP-9347-2021

Date of decision-06.10.2021

Hushanpreet Singh and another ...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. P.S.Bhinder, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Through this criminal writ petition, the petitioners are praying for a writ of mandamus by way of directions to the respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 to 6, who are against the alliance of the petitioners and further issuance of directions to official respondents to not to register false case against the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being known to each other, fell in love and decided to marry, but when their relationship came to the knowledge of private respondents, who are father, uncle and grand-mother of petitioner No.2, they refused to accept their alliance as they wanted to preform the marriage petitioner No.2 with a boy of their own choice. They started torturing petitioner No.2, therefore, she left her house on 18.09.2021 and contacted petitioner No.1. Now, petitioners decided to reside

together till petitioner No.2 attains the statutory marriageable age. Petitioners have apprehension that private respondents would cause harm to them, who are also threatening to implicate them in a false criminal case, therefore, a representation dated 20.09.2021 (Annexure P-3) was given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, but no action has been taken on the same. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court finds that the petition is founded on bald averments and is not supported by any convincing material. Further, the apprehension of the petitioners that private respondents would implicate them in a false criminal case, cannot be construed as a threat as they too are free to avail their remedy in law.

Apart from it, the representation submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.2 also lacks material particulars and does not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners.

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

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

06.10.2021

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

Yes

No

Yes

No