

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

CRWP-8127-2022

Date of Decision:-26.08.2022

Priya Saini & Anr.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Bhunesh Lakhera, Advocate for the Petitioners.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J.(ORAL)

The petitioners have approached this Court for issuance of necessary directions to respondents No. 1 to 3 for protecting their life and liberty which according to them is at stake because they are in a live-in relationship. The date of birth of the petitioner no.2-Neeraj Kumar is 10.07.2002 and he is minor. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the private respondents are extending threats to the petitioners that they cannot live together.

The learned counsel for the petitioners has also submitted that a marriage is not a must for providing security to a couple in a 'live-in relationship' because protection qua life and liberty is sacrosanct and stands at the highest pedestal. He has also placed reliance upon orders passed by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court in '*Sarabjeet Kaur and another versus*

State of Punjab and others' in CRWP-102-2022 decided on 07.01.2022

and ‘*Goutam Kumar and another versus State of Punjab and others*’ in
CRWP-8088-2021 decided on 26.08.2021.

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Since no order prejudicial to the interest of the parties is being passed, therefore, there is no necessity of inviting any response.

At this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, as well as on the age and nature of the relationship between the petitioner no.1 and petitioner no.2, I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No. 2 to look into the matter and pass an appropriate order in the representation allegedly filed by the petitioners before him on 22.08.2022 (Annexure P-1). It would be appreciated if necessary orders are passed within one month from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

However, if the petitioners is found to have been involved in any other case then this order shall not preclude the competent authority from taking lawful action against the petitioner.

Disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

August 26, 2022
Vinay

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