

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

CRWP-10867-2022

Date of Decision: November 18, 2022

Nidhi and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Chander Shekhar Singhal, 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. 5 & 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are in a live-in relationship against the wishes of respondents No. 5 & 6 and have sought protection to their lives and liberty. It is submitted that petitioner No. 1-Nidhi, aged about 19 years and petitioner No. 2 – Rajit, aged about 18 years 09 months have not performed marriage because petitioner No. 2 is still underage, but they apprehend danger at the hands of private respondents No. 5 & 6 who will eliminate them.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No. 5 & 6, petitioners have allegedly moved a representation dated 14.11.2022, (Annexure P-3) to Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh (respondent No. 2), wherein, all the apprehension to their lives have been expressed.

Notice of motion.

On advance notice, Mr. Roopse Sharma, Advocate for Mr. Anil Kumar Lamjharria, Addl. P.P., U.T. Chandigarh, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 4 (State).

Since petitioners have not contracted any marriage and seek only protection *qua* their lives and personal liberty, and for the same already representation dated 14.11.2022 (Annexure P-3) is pending, it would be appropriate to direct respondent No. 2 to have a fair look to the said representation, 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, 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. 5 & 6.

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 18, 2022

Riya

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

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**