

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

CRWP-1587-2022

Date of decision-22.02.2022

Muskan and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Shubham Sharma, 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 to 6, as the petitioners have solemnized marriage on 16.02.2022 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the petitioners solemnized marriage on 16.02.2022 at Jai Naina Devi Jan Kalyan Sansatha, 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-Muskan (who are father, brother and maternal uncle of girl), who are against their alliance. He states that the private respondents threatened petitioners of dire consequences, therefore, a representation dated 16.02.2022 (Annexure P-5) has already been given to

Commissioner of Police, Panchkula, 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 16.02.2022 (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.

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