

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

**CRWP-10478-2022**

**Date of Decision: November 09, 2022**

**Manju and another**

**...Petitioners**

**Versus**

**State of Punjab and others**

**...Respondents**

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

Present: Mr. Sukhwinder Singh Dhillon, Advocate for the petitioners.

**SANJAY VASHISTH, J.**

By way of filing this petition, the petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberty in view of the fact that they are living in a live-in relationship and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7. Petitioner No.1 – Manju is aged about 20 years, whereas, petitioner No. 2 – Randeep Singh is aged about 21 years.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 7, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 03.11.2022, (Annexure P-3) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Sri Muktsar Sahib (respondent No. 2), wherein, all the apprehension to their lives has been expressed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners also submits that petitioner No. 1- Manju was earlier married with some other person but got divorce from her husband.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG,

Punjab, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (State).

Since petitioners have not contracted any marriage and seek only protection *qua* their lives and personal liberty, 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.

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 liberty from being invaded by private respondents No. 4 to 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.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)**  
**JUDGE**

**November 09, 2022**

Riya

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

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**