

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

112

**CRWP-5128-2022
Date of Decision: 27.05.2022**

VIVEK AND ANOTHER

.....PETITIONERS

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR

**Present: Mr. Dinesh Maurya, Advocate
for the petitioners.**

Mr. P.P.Chahar, DAG, Haryana.

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus hence directing respondents No. 2 to 4 to protect the live-in-relationship of the petitioners, against any threats being meted to them by respondents No. 2 to 4, and also against any interference in the peaceful life of the petitioners being made at the behest of respondents No. 5 to 8.

2. The learned State Counsel, does not have any objection, to an order being made by this Court to the respondents concerned, to look into and decide through a speaking order, representation Annexure P-3.

3. Consequently, this Court directs the respondents concerned, to within three weeks hereafter, hence decide Annexure P-3, through a speaking order.

4. However, the afore order is subject to the condition that, upon the investigating officer, discovering credible evidence, with respect to the age of the co-petitioner No.2, and, in case from the birth certificate concerned, it is clear that she is below 18 years, thereupon, upon, a complaint being filed by the father of the afore, it is open for the investigating officer concerned, to draw an appropriate action, against the accused, but in accordance with law. Nonetheless, he may not arrest him without issuing seven days notice upon him.

5. Petition is disposed of.

6. A copy of this order be given dasti on payment of usual charges.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

May 27, 2022
kavneet singh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No