

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

**CRWP No.7445 of 2021
Date of Decision:-09.08.2021**

Jaideep and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

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

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

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(Oral)

By way of the instant petition, both the petitioners seek the indulgence of this Court for the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing 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.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, 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 look into and take appropriate action on the said representation of petitioner No.2, i.e Annexure P-3.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

It is worth-while to mention here that as mentioned in para 4 of this petition itself, petitioner No.1 Jaideep was married to one Poonam but a compromise/Panchayati divorce has been effected between him and his afore-named wife. However, no documentary proof in respect thereof has been placed on the file.

Be that as it may, 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 as well as the above-discussed limited prayer as made by learned counsel for the petitioners and without commenting or expressing any opinion on the legality and validity of the said relationship between the petitioners, respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Karnal, is hereby directed to look into the said representation of petitioner No.2 (Annexure P-3) and if it is found that the petitioners genuinely deserve any protection, then to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

It is further clarified that this order shall not be construed to be a shield to the petitioners against any proceedings already initiated or intended/contemplated to be initiated against them by the competent

authority/person on account of their afore-said relationship and permissible under any relevant provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

August 09, 2021
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*