

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

CRWP-5819-2022

Date of decision : 16.06.2022

Taniya Rai and Anr.

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Ors.

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present: Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate for the petitioners.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (Oral)

The petitioners have approached this Court for issuance of necessary directions to respondents No. 1 to 3 for protecting their lives and liberties which according to them are at stake because they are in a live-in-relationship. Both the petitioners claim themselves to be major. According to the copy of the Aadhar Card, the exact date of birth of petitioner No.1 is 02.11.2003 and exact date of birth of petitioner No.2 is 11.07.2002. The copies of Aadhar Card of petitioners No.1 and 2 are annexed as Annexure P-1 and P-2 alongwith the petition.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a marriage is not a must for providing security to a couple in a 'live-in-relationship' because protection qua life and liberty is sacrosanct and stands at the highest pedestal. He has also placed reliance upon orders passed by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court in '*Sarabjeet Kaur and another versus State of Punjab and others*' in CRWP-102-2022

decided on **07.01.2022** and '*Goutam Kumar and another versus State of Punjab and others*' in **CRWP-8088-2021** decided on **26.08.2021**.

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3.

Mr.Amitoj Singh Dhaliwal, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Since no order prejudicial to the interest of the parties is being passed, therefore, there is no necessity of inviting any response.

At this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, as well as on the age and nature of the relationship between the petitioners, I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No.2- Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, to look into the matter and pass an appropriate order in the representation allegedly filed by the petitioners before him on 09.06.2022 (Annexure P-4). It would be appreciated if necessary orders are passed within one month from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

However, if the petitioners are found to have been involved in any other case then this order shall not preclude the competent authority from taking lawful action against the petitioners.

Disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

16.06.2022
manju

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No