

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

Sr.No.113

CRWP No.1244 of 2022

Date of Decision: 10.02.2022

Jyoti and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

(Heard through Video-Conferencing)

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

Present: Mr. Lajpat Rai Sharma, 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.2 and 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-5) 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 the present 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-5.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

It is pertinent to mention here that it has been averred in this petition that petitioner No.1 was married to respondent No.4 but was being tortured and harassed by him as well as his family members by demanding more dowry and therefore, she left her matrimonial home but her own family members also did not support her and therefore, she started residing with petitioner No.2.

Be that as it may, 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, Jind, is hereby directed to look into the said representation (Annexure P-5) of the petitioners 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 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.

10.02.2022
neetu

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>No</i>