

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

CRWP-4336-2022

Date of decision : 07.05.2022

Ripandeep Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Priyanshu Kamra, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioners have filed this criminal writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty, who apprehend danger at the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 14.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that petitioners being in relationship for the last three years, decided to marry each other on attaining the marriageable age, but when their relationship came to the knowledge of private respondent Nos.4 to 14 (who are parents and other relatives of petitioner No.1), same was not accepted by them as they wanted to solemnize her marriage with a boy of their choice. They threatened and gave beatings to petitioner No.1 and refused to accept their relationship despite convincing efforts and now trying to marry her with a person of their own choice. Therefore, petitioner No.1 ran away from her house on 04.05.2022, and joined the company of petitioner No.2, who decided to reside together till

petitioner No.2 attains the statutory marriageable age. He has further argued that the private respondents threatened petitioners of dire consequences and they have apprehension that private respondents would cause harm to them and they would implicate them in a false criminal case, therefore, a representation dated 05.05.2022 (Annexure P-3) was given to Senior Superintendent of Police, Moga, but no action has been taken on the same. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

After hearing the learned counsel for petitioners, 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 05.05.2022 (Annexure P-3) 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. Apart from it, as per the address given in representation as well as in the memo of parties, both petitioners are residing in their own house, therefore, it cannot be said that they are in live in relationship.

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.

07.05.2022

vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Yes	No
Yes	No