

120

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

**CRWP-4372-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:09.05.2022**

Bilkis and another

.. Petitioners**Vs.**

State of Haryana and others

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

Present: Ms. Rosi, Advocate for
Mr. M.D. Khan, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Articles 226 Constitution of India, petitioners have prayed for issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty, as they have solemnized marriage (Nikah) on 04.05.2022 against the wishes of private respondent Nos.4 to 12.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has contended that the petitioners are receiving threats from the private respondents, as they have solemnized marriage (Nikah) on 04.05.2022 against their wishes. She submits that there is every likelihood that the private respondents would implicate the petitioners in some false case by giving a complaint to the police. She has drawn the attention of the Court to the representation dated 04.05.2022 (Annexure P-5) submitted by petitioners to Superintendent of Police, Nuh, Mewat and contended that no action has been taken by the officer so far. She prays for issuance of necessary directions.

During the course of hearing, it is not disputed by learned counsel that the petitioners have solemnized marriage (Nikah) on

04.05.2022 and on the same day, they had given representation (Annexure

P-5) to Superintendent of Police, Nuh, Mewat. In the petition neither any specific threat or allegation has been attributed to any of the respondents nor any convincing material has been brought on record to substantiate the ground.

The sequence of events pleaded by the petitioners in their petition do not seem to be probable. Therefore, the prayer made by the learned counsel for issuance of directions to Superintendent of Police, Nuh, Mewat to look into their representation is also not worth acceptance, as it also lacks all kinds of necessary particulars regarding manner and mode of alleged threat. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension that the private respondents may falsely implicate them in some criminal case, but 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.

Apart from above, 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 against them.

Resultantly, this Court is not inclined to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

09.05.2022
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No