

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

111

**CRWP-10584-2022
Decided on : 10.11.2022**

Manpreet and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Azam Khan, Advocate for
Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

By way of filing this petition, 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 threat at the hands of respondents No.4 to 7.

Though petitioner No.2 – Akashdeep Singh is not of marriageable age being 19 years of age, has approached this Court for seeking protection *qua* live in-relationship.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 7, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 07.11.2022 (Annexure P-3) to the Sr. Superintendent of Police, Batala, District Gurdaspur (respondent No.2), wherein, all the apprehensions *qua* their lives and liberty has been expressed.

Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. AS Sandhu, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of State-respondents No.1 to 3.

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 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 liberty of the petitioners from being invaded by private respondents No.4 to 7.

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 and age of petitioners. Respondent No.2 would consider and pass necessary order without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded hereinabove.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

November 10, 2022

J.Ram

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