

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

Sr. No.118

CRWP-8876-2020

Date of decision:- 29.10.2020

Akansha Chanchal and another

..Petitioners

VERSUS

U.T. Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Raje Ram Kaushik, Advocate for the petitioners.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed for protection of lives and liberty of the petitioners. They are in a live-in-relationship and fear for their lives and liberty, which are allegedly being threatened by the private respondents (relatives of petitioner No.1-girl, namely, Akansha Chanchal).

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are above 18 years of age and can lawfully take decisions affecting their personal life. Petitioner No.1 was being forced by her parents to marry against her wishes and therefore, she left her family to live with petitioner No.2. Now, the petitioners are being threatened by the private respondents and they fear for their lives and liberty. Despite, representation dated 21.10.2020 (Annexure P-2) having been submitted before respondent No.3, no protection has been provided to the petitioners.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only.

CRWP-8876-2020

Mr. Lalit Kumar Gupta, APP, U.T. Chandigarh accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 and waives service.

Considering the nature of the order being passed, there is no necessity to serve the private respondents or to seek a reply from any one of the respondents.

Although, a live-in-relationship is generally frowned upon in society and not legally recognized, if two adults live together out of their own free will, no law is violated. The relationship may be socially taboo, but perception of the society does not empower the private respondents to act as vigilantes. Thus, the petitioners' lives and liberty deserve to be protected. If any law has been violated, they can be proceeded against in accordance with law and not by way of extra legal methods.

Thus, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the representation dated 21.10.2020 (Annexure P-2) and to take appropriate action and if situation so demands, protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners.

This order shall not be deemed to be a restraint on initiation of civil/criminal proceedings, in accordance with law.

29.10.2020

Ankur Goyal

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No