

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

**CRWP No.91 of 2020
Date of decision:08.01.2020**

Karamjit Kaur and another ... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present:- Mr. Barjinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.

Petitioner No.1- Karamjit Kaur aged 37 years and petitioner No.2- Sukhwinder Singh aged 43 years, have filed the instant petition for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus for directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty by providing adequate security and for directing respondents No.4 and 5 not to interfere in their personal life and liberty.

Facts, in brief, are that the petitioners claim to know each other for the last six months and have strong liking for each other. They started living with each other. Petitioner No.1 is already married to respondent No.4 but is now living with petitioner No.2 with her own free will. Petitioner No.2 was also married but his wife had expired. On coming to know of the relationship between the petitioners, respondent No.4, husband of petitioner no.1 and respondent No.5, who is the son of petitioner no.1,

started harassing them. The petitioners met SHO, Police Station City, Sangrur, respondent No.3 and asked him to provide police protection. On his refusal to do so, they submitted a representation dated 19.12.2019 (Annexure P-4) to Superintendent of Police, Sangrur-respondent No.2. When no action was taken by the police authorities, they filed the instant petition.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has been heard. Petitioner No.1 is married to respondent No.4 and respondent No.5 is the son of petitioner no.1. Marriage of petitioner no.1 with respondent No.4 subsists and has not been dissolved by a Court decree. Despite this, petitioner No.1 is staying live-in-relationship with petitioner no.2. Such relationship has not been approved by this Court in CWP No.26067 of 2019 titled as Seema and another Vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 16.09.2019. Still further, apprehension of threat from respondents No.4 and 5 is not supported by any material on the record.

In this view of the matter, the writ petition cannot be entertained and is accordingly dismissed.

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

January 08, 2020
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No