

**Sr.No.113**

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

**CRWP No.7844 of 2020  
Date of decision:30.09.2020**

**Premlata and another**

**... Petitioner(s)**

**versus**

**State of Haryana and others**

**... Respondent (s)**

**Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jasgurpreet Singh Puri**

**Present:** Mr. Amandeep Vashisth, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

**Jasgurpreet Singh Puri, J.(Oral)**

Present petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of Constitution of India with a prayer to issue a writ directing respondents No.1 to 5 for grant of protection of life and liberty to the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.6 to 19.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that both the petitioners are in live-in relationship and that petitioner No.1 is already married to respondent No.16, namely, Umesh Kumar but due to differences with him she is not living with him and she is now started living with petitioner No.2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has further submitted

that private respondents are threatening the petitioners, therefore, has prayed that they should be protected at the hands of the private respondents.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 4 only at this stage.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Naveen Kr. Sheoran, DAG, Haryana present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

It is a case where petitioner No.1 who is already married with respondent No.16 and after leaving him without any divorce has started living with petitioner No.2 and is seeking direction from this Court for invoking extra-ordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Although live-in relationship has been accepted in the Indian legal system lately but it is a case where one of the petitioner is already married and without obtaining dissolution of marriage is living with the other petitioner and therefore, ordinarily the courts would be reluctant to interfere in such like matter. However, learned counsel for the petitioners has referred to para No.4 of the petition wherein it is stated that petitioner No.1 is pregnant since six months with the baby of petitioner No.2, therefore, in view of the specific circumstances of the present case, limited direction can be issued to respondents No.1 to 4 for the purpose of grant of protection of life and liberty, if so required. It is therefore, directed that respondent No.4, SHO

Police Station City Yamuna Nagar, District Yamuna Nagar shall look into threat perception of the petitioners and if so required, then take appropriate measure in accordance with law. It is made clear that the present directions are pertaining only to the protection of life and liberty of the petitioners and nothing more than that.

Disposed of.

30<sup>th</sup> September, 2020

Shivani Kaushik

[JASGURPREET SINGH PURI]

JUDGE

|                                  |               |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Whether Reportable</i>        | <i>Yes/No</i> |