

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

CRWP-12203-2021

Date of decision-27.12.2021

Anuradha and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Shiv Krishan Sehgal, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Through this criminal writ petition, the petitioners are praying for issuance of directions to the respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 to 6, as they have entered into marriage on 17.12.2021 against their wishes. It has been further prayed that the official respondents be restrained from implicating petitioners in false criminal case.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love for the last two years 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 to 6 (who are father and other relatives of petitioner No.1) as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. Therefore, on 17.12.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage as per Hindu rites. 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 18.12.2021 (Annexure P-4) to Senior Superintendent of Police, SAS Nagar, Mohali, 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 18.12.2021 (Annexure P-4) 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.

27.12.2021

vanita

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

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