

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

CRWP-8256-2022

Date of Decision: August 30, 2022

Ayudiya and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Manoj R. Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By way of filing this petition, the petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberties in view of the fact that they are in live-in relationship and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondent No. 4. Petitioner No.1 – Ayudiya is aged about 31 years, whereas, petitioner No. 2 – Amit Kumar is 20 years old.

2. In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondent No. 4, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 11.07.2022 (Annexure P-3) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur (respondent No. 2), wherein, all the apprehension to their lives has been expressed.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. J.S. Arora, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in court, accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No. 1 to 3.

5. Since 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 them.

6. 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 innocence of the petitioners is established, then respondent No. 2 shall proceed to take appropriate action in order to protect their lives and personal liberties from being invaded by private respondent No. 4.

7. This order is passed at this stage without meaning anything on the status of the petitioners on the basis of live-in relationship. Respondent No. 2 would pass necessary order without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded here-in-above.

8. Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

August 30, 2022

Pkapor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**