

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

CRWP-6858-2023

Date of decision : 13.07.2023

Mandeep Singh and another

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Manpreet Singh Kanda, Advocate for the petitioners.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Through this writ petition filed under Article 226 Constitution of India, the petitioners are praying for issuance of a writ of mandamus by way of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty and further for restraining the respondent Nos.4 to 6 from interfering in their peaceful life.

The facts in brief leading to the writ petition are that Harry Ramlla (petitioner No.2) got married with Sukhwinder Ram (respondent No.4) eight years ago and out of this wedlock, two children were born. After spending eight years with her husband, petitioner No.2 left her matrimonial house as her husband used to maltreat her under the influence of drugs and she started residing with petitioner No.1. When the relationship of the petitioners came into knowledge of private respondents, they turned against their alliance, therefore, petitioners apprehend that the private respondents would cause harm to them, therefore, they submitted a representation dated 07.07.2023 (Annexure P-3) to Senior Superintendent of Police, District Hoshiarpur, whereupon no action has been taken. Hence this writ petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioners being in love are living together, but are facing threats at the hands of private respondent Nos.4 to 6, therefore, petitioners deserve the protection. He submits that a representation was given to the respondent No.2, however, the same has not been looked into so far, therefore, the petitioners have approached this Court to seek protection of their life and liberty. He prays that appropriate direction be issued.

After hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners, this Court finds that the petitioner No.2 is already married, who has now entered into relations with petitioner No.1 without dissolution of marriage. The representation submitted by the petitioners to respondent No.2 lacks material particulars and even the manner and mode of alleged threat extended to the petitioners has not been mentioned. The petitioner No.2 has entered into unholy alliance with petitioner No.1 and the petition is based on bald averments without any supportive material.

Resultantly, this Court does not find any reason to exercise the extra ordinary writ jurisdiction.

Dismissed.

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

13.07.2023
vanita

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