

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

CRWP No.7202 of 2022

Date of Decision: 28.07.2022

Amarjeet Kour and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents.

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

Present:- Ms. Divya Narula, 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 respondent No.4 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.

Mr. Apoorv Garg, learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, has appeared on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 in this case in pursuance of the copies of the instant petition having been sent to the respondent-State in advance.

Heard.

Learned counsel for the petitioners restricts her prayer to the issuance of a direction to respondent No.2 to look into and take appropriate action on the said representation (Annexure P-3) of petitioner No.1.

Learned State counsel has no objection for the same.

However, it is pertinent to mention here that it has categorically been averred in Para No.3 in the petition that the husband of petitioner No.1 has already passed away and in Para No.9 therein, it has further been pleaded that petitioner No.2 also got married in the year 2011 but neither the death certificate of the husband of petitioner No.1 nor any document qua the dissolution of the marriage of petitioner No.2 with his wife have been placed on the file to substantiate the above-discussed averments.

Be that as it may, keeping in view the intent of the fundamental right enshrined in Article 21 of the Constitution of India which ensures the protection of life and liberty to the citizens as well as the afore-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, District Sirsa, is hereby directed to look into the said representation (Annexure P-3) of petitioner No.1 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 any competent authority/person on account of their said relationship and permissible under the relevant provisions of law.

This petition stands disposed of accordingly.

July 28, 2022
Yag Dutt

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes*

Whether Reportable: *No*