

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

CRWP-947-2022

Date of decision-02.02.2022

Chetna Kamboj and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Virender 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.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 and 5 and further not to harass them, as the petitioners have solemnized marriage on 28.01.2022 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners solemnized marriage on 28.01.2022 at Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir Society, MDC Sector-4, Panchkula as per Hindu Rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. He further argued that now, petitioners are facing threats from the family members of petitioner No.1-Chetna Kamboj (mother and brother of girl), who are against their alliance and they have apprehension that private respondents will cause harm to them and will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated

28.01.2022 (Annexure P-5) has already been given to Superintendent of Police, Karnal, 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 28.01.2022 (Annexure P-5) filed by petitioner No.1 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.

02.02.2022

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Yes	No
Yes	No