

CRWP-10310-2021
Date of decision-29.10.2021

Vs.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

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 7, as they have entered into marriage on 26.10.2021 against their wishes and further for restraining the respondent Nos.4 to 7 from interfering in their life.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love decided to solemnize marriage, but family members of petitioner No.1 (who are her parents and other relatives) were against their alliance as they wanted to perform her marriage with a boy of their own choice, therefore, on 26.10.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Pracheen Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir, MDC, Sector-4, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. In this regard the marriage photographs of petitioners are appended with the petition as Annexure P-4. He has further argued that the private respondents threatened petitioners and they have apprehension that

private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated 26.10.2021 (Annexure P-5) has already been given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Fatehgarh Sahib, 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.

After hearing the learned counsel, this Court finds that the petition contains bald averments regarding apprehension of threat allegedly faced by the petitioners, as the same is not supported with any convincing material. The representation dated 26.10.2021 (Annexure P-5) filed by petitioner No.1 simply contains her claim of marriage performed against the wishes of the private respondents and the averment regarding danger to their life also lacks material particulars, as it does not at all reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners.

Further, the apprehension expressed by 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.

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

Dismissed.

29.10.2021

vanita

**(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE**

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