

117

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-2094-2022 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:07.04.2022

Deepika and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ**

Present: None for the petitioners.

...

**Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)**

By means of this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India, petitioners seek a writ of mandamus by way of directions to official respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty from respondent Nos.4 to 6, as they are against petitioners' live-in-relationship.

Briefly, the facts pleaded in the writ petition are that petitioner No.1 Deepika, aged 21 years, already married and petitioner No.2 Nitin Singh aged 20 years, who fell in love with each other and decided to marry on attaining the age of majority as of now, they are residing together in live-in relationship. Petitioner No.1 is living separately from her husband (respondent No.4), who got emotional help from petitioner No.2. She has also filed a petition for dissolution of marriage between her and respondent No.4 under Section 13 Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. However, when the relationship of the petitioners came to the knowledge of respondents No.4 to 6 (husband and parents of petitioner No.1), they turned against their alliance and gave threats to the petitioners. Further it is apprehended that they would implicate them in a false criminal case, so, a representation dated

01.03.2022 (Annexure P-6) was given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala. But till date, no action has been taken upon it, therefore, it is prayed that the necessary directions be issued for providing protection to the petitioners.

Perusal of the petition shows that the averments contained in the petition lack the material particulars and do not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension that the private respondents may falsely implicate the petitioners in some criminal case and in the considered opinion of this Court, this apprehension is misplaced, as admittedly, no complaint has been made so far against them by the private respondents. Even, if it is assumed, that a complaint is given to the police by any of the private respondents against the petitioners, then it cannot be construed as threat to their life and liberty, as private respondents are also free to avail their remedy in law, in case they feel that some offence has been committed.

Resultantly, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for exercise of extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

07.04.2022  
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)  
JUDGE

|                           |     |    |
|---------------------------|-----|----|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes | No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes | No |