

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3701-2021

Date of Decision: April 16, 2021

Aarti and another

.... *Petitioners*

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.... *Respondents*

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIVEK PURI

Present: Mr. Deepak Kumar Gollen, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

*(The case has been taken up through video conferencing on
account of Covid-19 pandemic.)*

VIVEK PURI, J. (ORAL)

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of ***Nandakumar and another Versus State of Kerala and others, 2018 AIR (SC) 2254*** and judgment of this Court in ***CWP-31834-2019 titled as "Megha and another Versus State of Haryana and others, decided on 04.11.2019.***

It has been stated that although both the petitioners are major, but petitioner no.2 has not attained the age for valid marriage. Though, the petitioners are in live in relationship, but it has been pointed out that none of them was married at the earlier instance and they are apprehending threat and danger to their lives and liberty at the instance of respondent Nos. 4 to 8, who are relatives of both the petitioners.

Without dilating further, suffice is to say that the Court is primarily concerned with the petitioners' right to protect their lives and liberty against any perceived threat at the instance of third party as such right has been guaranteed to them as per Article 21 of the Constitution of India.

It has been pointed out that a representation dated 13.04.2021 (Annexure P-5) has already been submitted to respondent No.2.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajneesh Chadwal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Without making any further observations on the merits or legality and validity of the relationship, the petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent no.2 –Superintendent of Police, Panipat to look into the grievance of the petitioners as projected through a representation dated 13.04.2021 (Annexure P-5) in accordance with law and furthermore, take remedial action, if the apprehension of danger is real and genuine one.

This order is not to be construed as any opinion with regard to the legality and validity of relationship or age of the petitioners or factum or validity of their relationship or any civil or criminal proceedings.

April 16, 2021

vk d

**(VIVEK PURI)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes / No*
Whether reportable : *Yes / No*