

CRWP-10919-2021
Date of decision-18.11.2021

State of Haryana and others **...Respondents**

Present: Mr. Amit Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

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.3 and 4, as they have entered into marriage on 12.11.2021 against their wishes and further not to harass petitioners and family parents of petitioner No.2.

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 mother and brother) were against their alliance. He further submitted that the private respondents wanted to perform the marriage of petitioner No.1 with a boy of their own choice, therefore, on 12.11.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir Society, MDC Sector-4, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. He has further argued that petitioners have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated 13.11.2021 (Annexure P-4) has already been given to Superintendent of Police, Kaithal,

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 13.11.2021 (Annexure P-4) by petitioners simply contains their 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. Apart from it, presently petitioners are residing at Kaithal, whereas private respondents are residents of Madhya Pradesh and the apprehension expressed by the petitioners is not convincing.

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.

18.11.2021

vanita

**(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE**

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