

244

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-10366-2020

Date of decision-17.08.2021

Reena and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

Union Territory Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: None for the petitioners.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal, APP, U.T. Chandigarh.

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 to 4 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.5 and 6 as they have solemnized marriage on 07.12.2020 against their wishes.

On 11.12.2020, following order was passed:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the petitioners are receiving threats from respondent Nos.5 & 6 as they have entered into marriage on 07.12.2020 against their wishes.

Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 4 only, at this stage.

Ms. Vasundhara Dalal, APP, UT, Chandigarh, accepts notice on behalf of official respondents. Counsel for the petitioners undertakes to forward the complete copy of the petition to Learned U.T. counsel through e-mail,

*during the course of the day.
Learned State counsel prays for time to verify the facts
and the existence of alleged threat.
On his request, adjourned to 04.01.2021.”*

Thereafter, no one has appeared in this case, however, status report by way of affidavit of Shruti Arora, IPS, Sub Divisional Police Officer (South) Chandigarh has been filed on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 wherein it is mentioned that the petitioners are not residing at the given address and in this regard, the statement of the owner of the house is appended as Annexure R-1.

Apart from above, the representation Annexure P-5 simply contains a fact that they have performed marriage against the wishes of the private respondents and the alleged bald averment of threat is not substantiated with any convincing material. Besides, no particulars regarding the said threat have been mentioned, much less its manner and mode.

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

The petition is dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

17.08.2021

geeta

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