

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

CRWP No. 7650 OF 2020

DATE OF DECISION : 25.09.2020

Manpreet Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

Present : Mr. Nitin Mittoo, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab.
(Presence marked through video conference).

ARUN MONGA, J. (ORAL)

A widow and a man married to someone else, both proclaiming to be in a live in relationship with each other, seek issuance of directions to the official respondents to protect their life and liberty, fearing threat from private respondents.

2. Pledged case is that husband of petitioner No.1 died on 23.05.2018. Since then, petitioner No.1 along with her two minor children (girl and a boy aged 10 years and 2) had been residing with her parents. She is now in a consensual relationship with petitioner No.2 for the last one year.

3. It is further stated in the petition that wife of petitioner No.2 has deserted him. Husband wife are thus living separately for the last four years. In the premise, both the petitioners, out of their free will, are living in a consensual relationship.

4. Relatives/family members of the petitioners are against the aforesaid live in relationship. Petitioners tried to convince their relatives but they are not inclined to accept their relationship and have threatened the petitioners to eliminate them. Fearing elimination, the petitioners ran away

from their earlier homes and have now started residing together at a new place.

The petitioners are running from pillar to post for saving their lives from the private respondents i.e. Respondent No.4 to 9. Respondent No.4 is stated to be the brother in law of the petitioner No.1 who is posted as police officer at PS Adampur. Respondent No.5 wife of respondent No.4, Respondent No.6 is the sister in law, respondent No.7 is the mother, respondent No.8 is the wife of petitioner No.2 and her brother namely Amandeep Singh is respondent No.9.

5. Learned counsel argues that it is in the interest of justice that the life, liberty and property of the petitioners being in danger at the hands of private respondents, be protected by the official respondents.

6. Heard.

7. The petition appears to have been filed to seek indulgence of this Court, to later use the same as a shield against the conceded violation of law committed by petitioner no.2, who has not taken divorce from his wife. There seems no threat, otherwise, to the life of the petitioners.

8. No grounds are made out to interfere.

9. Dismissed.

SEPTEMBER 25, 2020
vandana

(ARUN MONGA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :
Whether reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No