

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

CRWP-2259-2022

Date of decision : 14.03.2022

Vandana Thapar and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Ms. Supriya, Advocate for
Mr. Kuljit Singh Bal, 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 to 4 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.5 to 7, as the petitioners have solemnized marriage on 23.07.2019 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners solemnized marriage on 23.07.2019, but did not disclose this fact to their respective parents, however, when parents of petitioner No.1 forced her to marry with some other person, then she disclosed about her marriage to them. The private respondents refused to accept their relationship despite convincing efforts and threatened petitioners to eliminate, therefore, petitioner No.1 left her house on 07.03.2021 and joined the company of petitioner No.2. He has further argued that petitioners have apprehension that private respondents will implicate them in a false case, therefore, they moved representation dated 10.03.2022 (Annexure P-5) to Commissioner of Police and Station House

Officer, Jalandhar, 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 it is the case of the petitioners that they got married in July, 2019 and this fact was well within the knowledge of the parents as the writ petition contains a specific averment in para No.7 that initially the solemnization of the marriage was not disclosed to respondent Nos.5 to 7 as the couple had decided to convince them slowly and petitioner No.1 was allowed to reside with her parents, who tried her level best to convince them, but they kept on giving them threats. The representation or the averments in the writ petition do not disclose the alleged manner and mode of threat extended to the petitioners and no other complaint was ever made by any of the petitioners to the police before this representation dated 10.03.2022. The petition apparently is not based upon a valid cause of action.

Apart from it, 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.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

14.03.2022

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No