

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

CRWP-12223-2021

Date of decision-27.12.2021

Muskan and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Gaurav, Advocate for
Mr. Balkar Singh, 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 Nos.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 and 5, as the petitioners have solemnized marriage on 05.03.2021 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners solemnized marriage on 05.03.2021, but did not disclose this fact to their respective parents, however, when parents of petitioner No.1 forced her marriage with some other person, then she disclosed about her marriage to them. The private respondents gave beatings to petitioner No.1, therefore, she left her house on 21.12.2021 and joined the company of petitioner No.2. On 05.03.2021, petitioners solemnized marriage at Pracheen Guga Marhi, Rama Krishan Mandir, Sector-19,

Chandigarh as per Hindu rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) 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 21.12.2021 (Annexure P-5) to Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra, 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 21.12.2021 (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. Though it is mentioned in the representation that previously also beatings were given to petitioner No.1, but admittedly no complaint was made to the police.

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