

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRWP-8945-2022**

Date of Decision: September 16, 2022

Mehak Rani and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

By way of filing this petition, 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 – Mehak Rani is 20 years old, whereas, petitioner No. 2 – Rahul Kumar is about 18½ years old.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 8, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 13.09.2022 (Annexure P-3) to the Superintendent of Police, Yamunanagar (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. Vikas Bhardwaj, Assistant

Advocate General, Haryana, 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

September 16, 2022

Pk Kapoor

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

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**