

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

**CRWP-6581-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.07.2022**

Tanu Sharma and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Shakti Mehta, Advocate for the petitioners.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent Nos.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent Nos. 4 to 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 is major, but petitioner No.2-Harshpreet Singh, though major, is not of marriageable age. They are living together in live-in relationship. They would solemnise marriage, after attaining the marriageable age by petitioner No.2. He further submits that parents of petitioner No. 1 were informed, but they are issuing threats to the petitioners regarding their live-in relationship. The petitioners have already submitted a representation dated 06.07.2022 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, for redressal of their grievance.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners are living in a constant danger as they have every apprehension that the private respondents would catch them and carry out their threats and might go to the extent of even committing their murder. The petitioners are, therefore, running from pillar to posts for protection of their life and liberty.

Learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon the judgment passed by the *Hon'ble Supreme Court of India* in '**Nandakumar and Anr. Vs. The State of Kerala and others**', 2018(2) RCR(Civil) 899, wherein it was held that *even if the boy was not competent to enter into wedlock, they have right to live together even outside wedlock. It would not be out of place to mention that 'live-in relationship' is now recognized by the Legislature itself.* He also relies upon the judgment rendered by a Division Bench of this Court in LPA No.1678-2014, titled as '**Rajwinder Kaur and another Vs. State of Punjab and others**', decided on 09.10.2014.

Notice of motion to the respondents.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Harbir Sandhu, AAG Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

At this stage, Mr. Sandeep Singh, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of respondents No.4 to 6.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

Article 21 of the Constitution stipulates protection of life and liberty to every citizen and that no person shall be deprived of his life and personal liberty except according to procedure established by law.

It is the bounden duty of the State as per the Constitutional

obligations cast upon it to protect the life and liberty of every citizen. Mere fact that petitioner No.2 is not of marriageable age would not deprive the petitioners of their fundamental right as envisaged in the Constitution, being citizens of India.

In view of the above discussion, I dispose of the present petition with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, to decide the representation 06.07.2022 (Annexure P-3), moved by the petitioners in accordance with law and grant protection to them, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived.

It is made clear that this order shall not be taken to protect the petitioners from legal action for violation of law if any committed by them.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

11.07.2022

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking? Yes/No
Whether reportable? Yes/No