

117

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-9469-2021

Date of Decision: 05.10.2021

SHEHNAZPREET KAUR AND ANOTHER

.. Petitioners

Vs.

THE STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Vipul Aggarwal, 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 28.09.2021 against the wishes of private respondents No.4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that petitioner No.1 Shehnazpreet Kaur, aged 17 years and 11 months and petitioner No.2 Sandeep Singh aged 23 years 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 to 7), they opposed it. As a result of that, the petitioners performed marriage on 28.09.2021 as per Sikh rites and ceremonies at Gurudwara Guru Arjan Dev Ji, Village Dayanand Nangar, Nangli Bhatha, District Amritsar. 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 to 7 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 29.09.2021 (Annexure P-5) and contended that till date, no protection has been provided and further prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by the learned counsel that the police is visiting the house of the petitioner No.2, as some complaint has been given by the parents of petitioner No.1.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the apprehension expressed by the petitioners that the private respondents would implicate them in some false case is misplaced, as even if, it is believed that a complaint has been made to the police, the same cannot be construed as threat to their life and liberty, as private respondents are also free to avail their remedy in law. Apart from it, the representation lacks all necessary particulars regarding manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners.

Resultantly, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

05.10.2021
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes No
Yes No