

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

CRWP-9389-2021

Date of decision-01.10.2021

Balwinder Singh and another ...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Maninder Singh Bajwa, Advocate for the petitioners.
 Mr. J.S.Mahal, Advocate for respondent Nos.4 and 5.

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 for not harassing/implicating the petitioners in false criminal case at the instance of respondent Nos.4 and 5, as petitioners have solemnized marriage on 28.09.2021 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners solemnized marriage on 28.09.2021 as per Sikh rites at Gurudwara Guru Nanak Niwas Sahib, Village Karor Kalan, Tehsil Kharar, District Mohali. Now, they are facing threats from the family members of petitioner No.1-Balwinder Singh, who are against the alliance of the petitioners as petitioner No.2 belongs to different community. Petitioners have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated

28.09.2021 (Annexure P-5) has already been given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Hoshiarpur, but no action has been taken upon the same, so they have approached this Court with a prayer to provide them protection. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

At this stage, Mr. J.S.Mahal, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent Nos.4 and 5 and files power of attorney. He states that private respondents have no objection to the alleged marriage of the petitioners and no threat has ever been extended to the petitioners as pleaded in the petition.

After hearing, learned counsel for the parties, this Court finds that the bald averments contained in the petition are not substantiated with any convincing material. The only 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.

Above all, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the private respondents has stated that they are not opposing the alleged alliance of the petitioners.

In view of the above, this Court does not find it to be a fit

case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

01.10.2021

vanita

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No