

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

CRWP-3138-2022

Date of decision : 06.04.2022

Manpreet Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Pardeep Kumar Kapila, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioners have approached this Court under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of a writ 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 03.04.2022 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love with each other decided to solemnize marriage, but private respondent Nos.4 to 8 (who are parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1) refused to accept their relationship 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 alliance despite convincing efforts and threatened them to eliminate. Therefore, on 03.04.2022 petitioners solemnized marriage at Gurudwara Dashmesh Pita Patshahi Daswi at village Singha Devi as per Sikh rites. He has further argued that the private respondents threatened petitioners of dire consequences, therefore, they sent

representation dated 04.04.2022 (Annexure P-4) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Ropar, 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 04.04.2022 (Annexure P-4) 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.

06.04.2022

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Yes	No
Yes	No