

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRWP-2037-2021 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-2.3.2021

Pooja and another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Simranjeet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate for respondents No.4 to 8.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. Petitioner No.1-Pooja aged 22 years and petitioner No.2-Sunil Kumar aged 18 years, who are in a 'live-in' relationship, have approached this Court seeking issuance of a direction to official respondents to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehend threat to the same at the hands of respondents No.4 to 8, who do not approve of their 'live-in' relationship.
2. Without commenting as regards the veracity of the averments made in the petition and also as regards the sanctity of alleged relationship of the petitioners, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad, District Fatehabad to look into the matter and to dispose of the representation dated 22.2.2021 (Annexure P-3)

in accordance with law. In case, it is found that there is a genuine threat to the lives and liberty of the petitioners, then necessary steps warranted under law be taken thereupon at the earliest so as to ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioners.

3. A copy of this order alongwith copy of the representation dated 22.2.2021 (Annexure P-3) be sent to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Fatehabad, District Fatehabad so as to enable him to do the needful expeditiously.
4. It is, however, clarified that the aforesaid order shall not be taken to be any expression as regards the alleged relationship of the petitioners and shall not confer any immunity upon the petitioners, in case it is found that they have committed any wrong.
5. It may here be mentioned that during the course of arguments Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate had put in appearance on behalf of respondents No.4 to 8 and had requested that the private respondents be permitted to talk to petitioner No.1-Pooja. The matter had thus been adjourned to the post lunch session and the counsel for the petitioners had been requested to arrange for a video conference through Whatsapp between petitioner No.1 and her parents.
6. When the matter was takenup in post lunch session, the learned counsel for the petitioners informed that video conference was organised but petitioner No.1-Pooja specifically expressed that she does not wish to stay with respondents No.4 to 8.

2.3.2021

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes / No