

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

CRWP-10643-2022

Date of Decision: November 11, 2022

Monika Rani and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. R. S. 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 in a live-in relationship and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 7. Petitioner No.1 – Monika Rani is aged about 26 years, whereas, petitioner No. 2 – Sajjan Kumar is aged about 31 years.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 7, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 30.10.2022, (Annexure P-3) to Senior Superintendent of Police, SBS Nagar (respondent No. 2), wherein, all the apprehension to their lives has been expressed.

It is averred in the petition that Petitioner No. 1-Monika Rani is stated to be previously married to Sandeep Kumar (respondent No. 4) and out of said wedlock, one daughter was born. Thereafter, respondent No. 4 left to Pourtgale living his wife-petitioner No. 1 and her daughter in lurks. After that petitioner No. 1 came in the contact of petitioner No. 2 and both

of them have started liking each other and started living in a ***Live-in Relationship***.

While making submission, learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon the judgment dated 18.07.2022 passed by co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CRWP No. 4644 of 2021 (Ashok Kumar and anr. v. State of Punjab and others)**.

In the said case also, direction to look into the representation already submitted by the parties, was passed after considering the basic feature of the Constitution of India as per which every citizen has a right to live his/her life with a person of his/her choice emanating out of Article 21.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. J .S. Arora, DAG, 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 11, 2022

Riya

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

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**