

115

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-10320-2021

Date of Decision: 29.10.2021

Diljeet Kaur and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Harmandeep Singh, 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 18.10.2021 against the wishes of private respondents No.4 to 6.

Briefly, the facts pleaded in the writ petition are that the petitioners are major, who fell in love with each other and decided to marry. 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 Diljeet Kaur with a boy of their own choice. As a result of that, the petitioners performed marriage on 18.10.2021 as per Hindu rites and rituals at Maa Bhadarkali Jyotshi Kender, Mata Mansa Devi Market, Sector-4, Panchkula against the wishes of private respondents. After their marriage, the petitioners are receiving serious threats to their life and liberty from the parents of petitioner No.1 and in this regard, petitioners submitted a representation dated 21.10.2021 (Annexure P-4) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda. 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 21.10.2021 (Annexure P-4) and contended that till date, no protection has been provided and further prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner has admitted that upon a complaint by parents of petitioner No.1, the FIR has been lodged against the parents of petitioner No.2 (Lakhveer Singh), however, he is not aware of the particulars of the said FIR.

After hearing the learned counsel, this Court finds that the averments contained in the petition do not contain the material particulars, much less the alleged manner and mode of threat extended to the petitioners. Apart from it, it is also evident that the private respondents have adopted a remedy available in law by giving a complaint to the police, therefore, the apprehension of threat expressed by the petitioner is misplaced.

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

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

29.10.2021

Jasmine Kaur

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes	No
Yes	No