

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

CRWP-8986-2022

Date of Decision: September 19, 2022

Radhika Sharma and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaswinder Singh 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 live-in relationship and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 8. Petitioner No.1 – Radhika Sharma is about 20 years of age, whereas, petitioner No. 2 – Jatin is about 19 years of age.

2. In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 8, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 10.09.2022 (Annexure P-1) to Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana (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. Jaswinder Singh Arora, DAG, 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 respondents No. 4 to 8.

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

September 19, 2022

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