

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

CRWP-945-2022

Date of decision : 14.03.2022

Ratinder Kaur Randhawa and another ...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. DPS Bajwa, 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 to 8, as they have entered into marriage on 30.01.2022 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love decided to solemnize marriage and when they disclosed this fact to private respondent Nos.4 to 8 (who are mother/brother of petitioner No.1 and father of petitioner No.2), same was not accepted by them as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. They gave severe beatings to petitioner No.1 and refused to accept their relationship despite convincing efforts and threatened them to eliminate. Therefore, on 30.01.2022 petitioners solemnized marriage at Gurudwara Sahib Kror Kala, District Mohali as per Sikh rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. He has further argued that the private respondents threatened petitioners of dire consequences, therefore, they sent

representation dated 31.01.2022 (Annexure P-5) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Mogha, District Mogha, 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 31.01.2022 (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 petition that private respondents gave beatings to petitioner No.1, but admittedly no complaint was made by her 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.

14.03.2022

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

(MANOJ BAJAJ)

JUDGE

Yes

No

Yes

No