

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

113

**CRWP-10280-2022
Decided on : 31.10.2022**

Kajol and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sylvester Stephen, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

By way of filing this petition, the petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberty in view of the fact that they have not solemnized their marriage so far and are living in a **live-in relationship** and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondents No.4 to 8. Petitioner No.1 – Kajol is about 17 years old, whereas, petitioner No.2- Ranjit Singh, is about 31 years old.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 8, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 26.10.2022 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2 - Deputy Commissioner of Police, Amritsar, 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. JS Arora, DAG, Punjab, 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 liberty, 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

October 31, 2022

J.Ram

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