

CRWP-11402-2021
Date of decision-03.12.2021

State of Punjab and others **...Respondents**

Present: Mr. Karandeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Kuldeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Through this criminal writ petition, the petitioners are praying for issuance of directions to the respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 and 5, as they have entered into marriage on 24.11.2021 against their wishes. It has been further prayed that directions be issued to not to implicate petitioners in false criminal case.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love decided to solemnize marriage and when they expressed their decision to the parents of petitioner No.1, the same was not accepted by private respondent Nos.4 and 5 (parents of petitioner No.1) as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. Therefore, on 23.11.2021, petitioner No.1 left her house and joined the company of petitioner No.2. On 24.11.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Gurudwara Singh Sabha, District Ferozepur as per Sikh rites. In this regard the photograph (Annexure P-3) is appended with the petition. He has further argued that petitioners have apprehension that private respondents will

implicate them in a false case, therefore, they sent representation dated 26.11.2021 (Annexure P-5) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Ferozepur, 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 for parties, 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 26.11.2021 (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.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

03.12.2021

vanita

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