

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

Sr.No.116

**CRWP No.6804 of 2021
Date of Decision: 23.07.2021**

Nikhil Goyal and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present: Mr. Gursevak Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

By way of this petition, both the petitioners have approached this Court for seeking the relief of the issuance of a direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehend threat to the same at the hands of respondents No.4 to 8, because they (petitioners) are living in relationship. It has also been mentioned in this petition that a representation (Annexure P-3) has already been moved to respondent No.2 in this regard.

Ms. Samina Dhir, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, has joined the proceedings on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case, in pursuance of the copies of this petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance.

Heard.

....

Learned counsel for the petitioners restricts his prayer to the issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 to take appropriate action on the said representation of the petitioners, i.e. Annexure P-3.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same but she apprises the Court that a complaint has already been moved by respondent No.7 at Police Station Bhawanigarh qua the present matter.

It is pertinent to mention here that as per the copy of the Aadhar Card (Annexure P-2) of petitioner No.2-Gurpreet Kaur, her date of birth is 20.12.2005 meaning thereby she has not yet attained the age of majority, i.e. 18 years.

However, keeping in view the intent of the fundamental right enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India which ensures the protection of life and liberty to the citizens and the above-discussed limited prayer as made by learned counsel for the petitioners and also without commenting or expressing any opinion on the validity and legality of the relationship between the petitioners, respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, is hereby directed to look into the said representation of the petitioners (Annexure P-3) only to the extent of the threat perception of the petitioners qua their lives and if it is found that the petitioners genuinely deserve the protection of their lives, then to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

It is further clarified that this order shall not amount to be a hindrance to/in the inquiry qua the afore-mentioned complaint as moved by respondent No.7 to the police and shall also not be construed to be a

....

shield to the petitioners against any other action already initiated or intended/contemplated to be initiated against them by any competent authority/person on account of the afore-discussed facts and circumstances and permissible under any relevant provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

23.07.2021
neetu

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No