

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

CRWP-4015-2022

Date of decision : 29.04.2022

Nanaki Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Ms. Riti Aggarwal, Advocate for
Mr. Sunny Singla, 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 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 and 5, as they have entered into marriage on 27.04.2022 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that despite the representation dated 27.04.2022 (Annexure P-4), no action has been taken by Senior Superintendent of Police, Mansa as the petitioners are facing threats to their life at the hands of private respondent Nos.4 and 5 for performing marriage on 27.04.2022, against their wishes. She prays that appropriate direction be issued.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the love affair of the petitioners commenced two years back and this fact was brought to the notice of the parents of the girl around six months before performing the marriage, but no harm was ever caused to the

petitioners by the father and brother of petitioner No.1 and even no complaint was ever given by the petitioner No.1 against them.

The present petition is founded on apprehension of danger which has erupted after solemnization of marriage and upon disclosing the same to the private respondents, but the representation alleging threats at their hands is silent about the material particulars. The apprehension that the petitioners would be implicated in a false case is not supported with any material, and even if, it is assumed that a complaint is given by the private respondents against petitioner No.2, 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.

29.04.2022
vanita

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

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