

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

253

**CRWP-2006-2019
Date of Decision : 27.01.2020**

Manju and anotherPetitioners
Versus

State of Haryana and othersRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Ms. Priyanka Vij, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Arjun Singh Yadav, AAG Haryana
for respondents No.1 to 3.

Respondents No.4 to 6 in person.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners, while pleading that petitioner No.1 who is married to Surender is living with petitioner No.2 with mutual consent, have filed the present petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus for directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect their life and liberty from the danger at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

While issuing notice of motion, vide order dated 12.12.2019 passed by this Court, respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Jind was directed to look into the grievances of the petitioners and take appropriate action for protection of their life and liberty.

Respondents No.4 to 6, who have appeared in person, have submitted that they will not interfere in married life of the petitioners and there will be no danger from their side to their life and liberty.

Reply on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 by way of affidavit of Sh. Dalip Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Uchana, District Jind has been filed which is taken on record.

In the reply, the deponent has submitted that the petitioners are residing in live-in-relationship at village Thua of Police Station Alewa and they are not apprehending any danger to their life and liberty. Respondents No.4 to 6 who are brothers and mother of petitioner No.1 were also joined in the inquiry and their statements were recorded. Respondents No.4 to 6 have stated that they have no objection to petitioner No.1 residing with petitioner No.2 and they have not threatened petitioner No.1. The Superintendent of Police, Jind has directed vide letter dated 18.12.2019 that the life and liberty of the petitioners be protected in accordance with law and as per request of the petitioners.

Learned Counsel for the petitioners has also submitted that now there is no apprehension of danger to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

In view of the above, no further action is required to be taken on the petition, which is disposed of accordingly.

However, the petitioners shall be at liberty to seek protection of their life and liberty in case of apprehension of any danger by them from respondents No.4 to 6.

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

27.01.2020
Kothiwal

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