

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

115

CRWP-9283-2022

Decided on : 26.09.2022

Kaliyani Kumari and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Petitioners in-person.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Counsel are abstaining from work today.

There appears to be some typographical mistake in the Aadhar number of petitioner No.2 – Didar Singh, which has been typed in the memo of parties. On asking of the Court, petitioner No.2 produced his original Aadhar card, and on comparison, it is found same as that of photocopy of the Aadhar card annexed as Annexure P-2 with the paper-book.

By way of filing this petition, the 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 & 5. Petitioner No.1 is about 18 years old, whereas, petitioner No.2 is about 19 years old.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 5, petitioners have allegedly moved complaint dated 22.09.2022 (Annexure P-3) to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Fatehgarh Sahib (respondent No.2), wherein, all the apprehension to their lives has been expressed.

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 5.

The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without commenting 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 26, 2022

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*