

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

Sr.No.117

CRWP No.6587 of 2022

Date of Decision: 11th July, 2022.

Beena Devi & Another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & Others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Karan Singh Advocate,
for the petitioners.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J. (ORAL)

By way of this petition, both the petitioners have approached this Court for seeking the relief of the issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing official respondents No.1 to 3 to protect their lives and liberty as they apprehend threat to the same at the hands of the private 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-3) has already been moved to respondent No.2 in this regard.

Ms. Ambika Sood, learned Additional Advocate General, Haryana, has appeared on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case, in pursuance of the copies of this 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 petitioner No.1, i.e Annexure P-3.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

It is worth-while to mention here that in the copy of the Aadhar Card Annexure P-1, the date of birth of petitioner No.1-Beena Devi has been recorded as '**08.07.2006**' meaning thereby that she is minor and hasn't yet attained the age of 18 years.

However, 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, Kaithal, is hereby directed to look into the said representation of petitioner No.1 (Annexure P-3) only to the extent of the threat perception of the petitioners qua their lives and if it is found that the petitioners genuinely deserve the protection of their lives, 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 any competent authority/person on account of their said relationship and permissible under any relevant provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

11.07.2022.
seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes
Whether Reportable?	No

