

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

Sr.No.119

CRWP No.6708 of 2022

Date of Decision: 14th July, 2022.

Jagdeep Kaur & Another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & Others

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Armaan Gagneja, 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 10 because they (petitioners) are living in relationship. It has also been mentioned in this petition that a representation (Annexure P-4) 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 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-4.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

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-Senior Superintendent of Police, Sirsa, is hereby directed to look into the afore-said representation (Annexure P-4) 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.

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

14.07.2022.
seema

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes
Whether Reportable?	No

