

**116 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRWP-1593-2022****Date of decision-22.02.2022****Shivani and another****...Petitioners****Vs.****State of Haryana and others****...Respondents****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ**

Present: Mr. Parvesh Mor, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

By means of this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India, petitioners seek a writ of mandamus by way of direction to official respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from respondent Nos. 4 and 5, as the petitioners have solemnized marriage on 11.02.2022 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that as the petitioners were in love with each other for the last one year and their alliance was being opposed by the parents of petitioner No.1-Shivani, because they wanted to marry her with boy of their choice, therefore, petitioners solemnized marriage on 11.02.2022 at Shree Sidh Hanuman Shiv Sakti Sewa Smiti, Jind as per Hindu Rites. In this regard the photographs (Annexure P-4) are appended with the petition. Learned counsel has invited the attention of the Court to the representation dated 14.02.2022 (Annexure P-5) given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Sonipat, wherein it is mentioned that the parents of the girl would lodge the false complaint against us. He submits that no action has been taken upon the representation, therefore, petitioners have approached this Court with

a prayer to provide them protection. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

A perusal of the memo parties reveals that the parents of petitioner No.1 are not party in this petition, whereas respondent Nos.4 and 5 who are brother and uncle, respectively of petitioner No.1 and concededly no representation against them has been given to the police by the petitioner No.1. Apart from it, even if it is assumed that the complaint is being given against the petitioners by the parents of petitioner No.1, the same 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	
22.02.2022	Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
vanita	Whether Reportable :	Yes	No