

**113 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRWP-4151-2022****Date of decision : 05.05.2022****Ravi and another****...Petitioners****Vs.****State of Punjab and others****...Respondents****CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ****Present: Mr. Kulwinder Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.***********MANOJ BAJAJ, J.**

Through this criminal writ petition, the petitioners are praying for issuance of directions to the respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect their life and liberty from private respondent Nos.4 and 5, as they have entered into marriage on 30.04.2022 against their wishes.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in love decided to solemnize marriage and when they disclosed this fact to private respondent Nos.4 and 5 (who are mother and brother of petitioner No.2), same was not accepted by them. They refused to accept their relationship, therefore, on 30.04.2022, petitioners solemnized marriage at Prachin Pashupati Nath Shiv Mandir Society, Sector-4, MDC, Panchkula as per Hindu rites. He further argued that now, petitioners are facing threats from the family members of petitioner No.2, who are against their alliance and they have apprehension that private respondents will cause harm to them and will implicate them in a false case, therefore, a representation dated 02.05.2022 (Annexure P-4) has already been given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Bathinda, 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 02.05.2022 (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.

Apart from it, as per pleadings, petitioner No.1 faced prosecution through FIR No.15 dated 21.01.2020 under Sections 363, 366-A and 376 IPC and Sections 3 and 4 POCSO Act for alleged commission of rape of petitioner No.2 and the said case was registered at the instance of private respondent No.4, but the said trial ended in his acquittal. Admittedly, during the trial proceedings, petitioner No.1 never raised any issue of threat at the hands of respondent Nos.4 and 5.

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

Dismissed.

05.05.2022

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :

Whether Reportable :

(MANOJ BAJAJ)

JUDGE

Yes

No

Yes

No