

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

122

CRWP-7886-2022

Decided on : 22.08.2022

Saveta Devi and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Amit Kashyap, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

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 to 8. Petitioner No.1 is above 24 years old, whereas, petitioner No.2 is above 29 years old.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 8, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 16.08.2022 (Annexure P-4) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh (respondent No.2), wherein, all the apprehension to their lives has been expressed.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Shashank Bhandari, Addl. PP, UT Chandigarh, who is present in court, 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 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 to 8.

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. Respondent No.2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded hereinabove.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 22, 2022

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No