

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

Sr.No.111

**CRWP No. 8561 of 2021
Date of Decision: 09.09.2021**

Najani Rani and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Raj Kumar, 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 6, while averring that respondents No.4 and 5 are the parents and respondent No.6 happens to be the husband of petitioner No.1 and due to her maltreatment, harassment and torture at the hands of her husband, she (petitioner No.1) was constrained to leave her home and presently, she is living with petitioner No.2 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. S.S. Pannu, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, has appeared 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.

Keeping in view the intent of the fundamental right as 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 relationship between the petitioners, respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, is hereby directed to look into the said representation (Annexure P-3) of the petitioners only to the extent of their (petitioners') threat perception 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 be construed to be a shield to the petitioners against any action/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.

09.09.2021
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable

No