



CRWP-1460-2025 **1**
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

114

CRWP-1460-2025
Decided on: 14.02.2025

Kiran Meena and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Hasan Kaur, Advocate for the petitioner(s)
(through video conferencing).

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. Prayer in the instant petition, filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing official respondents No. 2 and 3 not to harass the petitioners at the instance of respondents No. 4 to 7, as the petitioners have performed marriage against the wishes of respondent No.4. In furtherance thereto, there is a prayer for providing protection of life and liberty of the petitioners and family members of petitioner No.2.

2. Perusal of the paper-book reveals that petitioner No.1-Kiran Meena is resident of Village Sujanpura, Mandsaur, Hamirgarh, Madhya Pradesh and petitioner No.2 is resident of Makan No.02, Ward No.20, Teh Garoth, Bhil Mohalla, Barkheda Ambekha, P.O. Garoth, District Mandsaur, Madhya Pradesh.

**CRWP-1460-2025****2**

From memo of parties, it appears that respondent No.4 (father of petitioner No.1) is resident of VPO Sujanpura, WNo.08, Hamirgarh, District Mandaur, Madhya Pradesh.

3. On being asked by the Court, counsel for the petitioners submits that now the petitioners have decided to reside in the State of Punjab at the address i.e. V.P.O. Gulzarpura Tharua, Tehsil and District Patiala, Punjab. In support of her contention, there is no substantive evidence/material brought on record showing that they have any connectivity with the State of Punjab in any manner. Moreover, prayer is made for issuance of writ in the nature of Manadamus for directing respondents No. 2 and 3, who do not have any jurisdictional access to the private respondent, who is staying in the State of Madhya Pradesh.

Moreover, it appears that present petition is misconceived one and a new policy have been adopted by the run away couples that they approach any High Court avoiding their appearance to avail legal remedy, which is available to them in their own State.

There is no satisfactory answer given by the petitioners as to why they did not approach to the High Court in the State of Madhya Pradesh for similar relief, thus, finding no merit and petition being completely misconceived, is hereby dismissed.

14.02.2025
rashmi

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**