

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

**CRWP-10114-2022  
Date of Decision: October 21, 2022**

**Bhavana Bhatia and another**

**...Petitioners**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab and others**

**...Respondents**

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

Present: Mr. Ajit Kumar Sharma, Advocate for  
Mr. Imran Farooqi, 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 living in live-in relationship and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondents No. 4 and 5. Petitioner No.1 – Bhavana Bhatia is aged about 25 years of age, whereas, petitioner No. 2 – Parveen is aged about 26 years.

2. In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No. 4 and 5, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 12.10.2022, (Annexure P-3) 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. J. S. 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 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**

**October 21, 2022**

Riya

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

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**