

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

113

CRWP-5525-2020

DATE OF DECISION: 04.08.2020

MANGAL SINGH AND ANOTHER

... Petitioner (s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr. S.P. Soi, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Senior DAG, Punjab.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners are seeking a direction to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty as they are apprehending threat from the private respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that petitioner No.1 was married earlier but as he was not maintaining good relations with his wife, he has entered into a live in relationship with petitioner No.2. He further contends that petitioner No.2 is an unmarried lady. He also contends that petitioner No.2 is also residing with petitioner No.1 but in a separate house and the first wife of the petitioner has no objection of the relationship. He also contends that petitioner No.2, who was earlier residing with her parents, had called petitioner No.1 that she is being threatened by her parents and it was in such circumstances that petitioner No.1 brought petitioner No.2 to his house and started living with her.

Heard through video conferencing.

It is apparent that petitioner No.1, who is already married, has entered into a live in relationship with petitioner No.2. Such kind of conduct cannot be countenanced. Reference can be made to the judgment of the coordinate Bench of this Court in the case of Rajwinder Kaur and another Vs. State of Punjab and others, in CWP No.25779 of 2019, decided on 13.09.2019, wherein petitioner No.1 therein, who was married, had left her matrimonial home and entered into a live in relationship with petitioner No.2 therein. The court had dismissed the petition while observing that under no circumstances can such a conduct be approved of. In the instant case, the apprehension expressed by petitioners No.1 and 2 that the private respondents are threatening them, appears to be unsubstantiated and the pleadings are insufficient to infer an imminent danger to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

04.08.2020.

SwarnjitS

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes / No
Whether reportable	:	Yes / No