

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

CRWP-10772-2021

Date of decision-15.11.2021

Nahisa Khatun @ Nancy and another ...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Parveen Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Arun Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Through this criminal writ petition, the petitioners are praying for a writ of mandamus by way of directions to the respondent No.2 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 and 5, as they have entered into marriage on 10.11.2021 against their wishes and further for restraining the respondent Nos.4 and 5 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) were against their alliance as they wanted to perform her marriage with a boy of their religion, therefore, on 04.11.2021, petitioner No.1 ran away from her house. On 10.11.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Shree Bharamari Devi Jan Kalyan Sanstha, Mans Devi Market, Sector-4, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. In this regard the marriage photographs of petitioners are appended with the petition as Annexure P-3. He has further argued that the private respondents

threatened petitioners and they have apprehension that private respondents will cause harm to them, therefore, a representation dated 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-8) has already been given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Panipat, 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 10.11.2021 (Annexure P-8) 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.

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

Dismissed.

15.11.2021

vanita

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

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