

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

CRWP-11628-2021

Date of decision-10.12.2021

Satnam Singh and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Shubham Saroha, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

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 to 7, as they have entered into marriage on 05.12.2021 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 and when they expressed their decision to the parents of petitioner No.2, the same was not accepted by private respondent Nos.4 to 7 (who are mother and other relatives of petitioner No.2) as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. Therefore, on 05.12.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi, Tehsil Kharar, District SAS Nagar Mohali as per Sikh rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. He has further argued that both petitioners are employed and are working in their respective offices at Barnala and Ludhiana before their marriage and private respondents had visited the office of petitioner No.2 and threatened her colleagues. He has argued that

the private respondents have threatened petitioners of dire consequences and they have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, they sent representation dated 06.12.2021 (Annexure P-5) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Ludhiana, 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. Neither the representation nor the averments in the writ petition disclose the incident, whereby the colleagues of petitioner No.2 were threatened by private respondents. The representation dated 06.12.2021 (Annexure P-5) filed 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.

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

10.12.2021

vanita

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