

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

109

**CRWP-7811-2022
Date of decision :18.08.2022**

Komal & Another

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab & Others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present:- Mr. Arjun Attri, Advocate, for
Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

By way of filing this petition, the petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberties in view of the fact that they have not solemnized their marriage so far and are living in the live-in relationship and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondents No.4 & 5. Petitioner No.1 is 19 years old, whereas, petitioner No.2 is only 18 years and 3 months old and is Hindu by religion.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No.4 & 5, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 09.08.2022 (Annexure P-3) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, District Ludhiana Rural (respondent No.2), wherein, all the apprehension to their lives has been expressed.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Bhupinder Beniwal, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No.1 to 3.

Since the petitioners have not contracted any marriage and seek only protection qua their lives and personal liberties, therefore, it would be

appropriate to direct respondent No.2, to have a fair look on the grievance of the petitioners raised in the representation in order to ascertain veracity of allegations made by the petitioners.

Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his/her own mechanism to ascertain the truth. He/she would also be at liberty to join the petitioners or any other person acquainted with facts in issue. If the innocence of the petitioners is established, then respondent No.2 shall proceed to take appropriate action in order to protect lives and personal liberties of the petitioners from being invaded by private respondents No.4 & 5.

The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without meaning anything on the status of the parties on the basis of live-in relationship and age of petitioner No.2. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded hereinabove.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

August 18, 2022
anil

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned :</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>