

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

113

CRWP-7158 of 2021

Date of Decision: 2.8.2021

Maninder and another

.... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr.Vaibhav Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners

...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

By this petition, the petitioners seek protection of life and liberty at the hands of respondents no. 4 and 5, who are stated to be the parents of petitioner no.1, as they are in a live-in relationship with each other (as contended) against the wishes of the said respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though the petitioners are not married to each other, and are in a live-in relationship with each other, however, neither of them is married earlier and they are not in any sapinda relationship to each other.

As regards proof of age of petitioner no.1, a copy of her Passport has been annexed as Annexure P-2 with the petition, showing her date of birth to be 12.4.1995, thereby making her above 26 of age.

As regards petitioner no.2, a copy of a certificate stated to have been issued by the National Institute of Open Schooling in April 2006 has been annexed as Annexure P-3, showing his date of birth to be 24.8.1988,

thereby making him about 33 years of age.

This being a petition seeking only protection of life and liberty of the petitioners which is a fundamental right of every citizen enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India, without making any comment whatsoever on the facts stated in the petition and as averred by learned counsel hereinabove, it is disposed of with a direction to respondents no.2 and 3 to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners is duly protected.

However, it is made absolutely clear that if any of the averments made in the petition is found to be incorrect or false, this order would not affect proceedings as per law in respect of any offence that may have been committed by the petitioners (being in a live-in relationship otherwise not being a criminal offence); and as regards learned counsel for the petitioners' contention that they have not got married to each other due to some property dispute, obviously this order will have no bearing whatsoever on any kind of property dispute existing qua either of the petitioners.

2.8.2021

pk

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
No/Yes