

116

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-4492-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:11.05.2022

Manisa Devi and another

.. Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Sahil Parmar, Advocate for the petitioners.

...

Manoj Bajaj, J. (Oral)

By means of this writ petition under Article 226 Constitution of India, petitioners seek a writ of mandamus by way of directions to official respondent Nos.1 to 4 to protect their life and liberty from respondent Nos.5 to 10, as they are against petitioners' live-in-relationship.

Learned counsel contends that petitioner No.1 Manisa Devi, aged 18 years, and petitioner No.2 Dinesh Kumar aged 18 years fell in love with each other, who decided to marry on attaining the age of majority. He states that when the relationship of the petitioners came to the knowledge of respondents No.5 to 10 (parents and relatives of petitioner No.1), they turned against their alliance, as they wanted to perform the marriage of Manisa Devi with a boy of their choice, therefore, petitioner No.1 ran away from her house and is now residing with petitioner No.2 in live in-relationship. He contends that the private respondents extended threats to the petitioners that they would implicate them in a false criminal case, therefore, a representation dated 09.05.2022 (Annexure P-3) was given to

SSP, SAS Nagar, Mohali, but till date, no action has been taken upon it,

therefore, the necessary directions be issued by providing protection to the petitioners.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the averments contained in the petition lack the material particulars and do not reveal the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners. Even respondent No.4 is residing beyond the territorial jurisdiction of Court. The petitioners have expressed an apprehension that the private respondents may falsely implicate the petitioners in some criminal case and 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. 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.

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

Dismissed.

11.05.2022
Jasmine Kaur

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No