

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

CRWP No.854 of 2022

Date of Decision: 31.01.2022

Anju Rani and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents.

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

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

Present:- Mr. Karandeep Singh Dargan, 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 the official respondents No.1 to 3 to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehend threat to the same at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 7 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. Gunkirat Kaur, learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, has joined the proceedings on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case in pursuance of the copies of the instant 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 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 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-Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, is hereby directed to look into the said representation of the petitioners (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/action 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.

January 31, 2022
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*