

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

**CRWP-9391-2022**

**Date of Decision: September 29, 2022**

**Satender and another**

**...Petitioners**

**Versus**

**State of Haryana and others**

**...Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH**

Present: Ms. Rosi, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

**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 living in live-in relationship and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondents No. 4 and 5. Petitioner No.1 – Satender is aged about 30 years of age, whereas, petitioner No. 2 – Ruchi is aged about 24 years.

2. In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No. 4 and 5, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 20.9.2022, (Annexure P-4) to Superintendent of Police, Nuh, District Nuh (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. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana, 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 and 5.

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 29, 2022**

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