

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

104

**CRWP-1214-2023
Decided on : 09.02.2023**

Reena and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Lovedeep Saini, Advocate for
Mr. Arun Kumar, 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 6.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that earlier petitioner No.1-Reena had solemnized marriage in March, 2016 with one Mukesh s/o Jiya lal r/o village Mundri, Tehsil and District Kaithal. No child was born out of the said wedlock and marriage was dissolved by way of decree dated 16.09.2020 passed in HMA petition No.78 dated 03.02.2020 by the Court of Principal Judge, Family Court, Kaithal. Judgment and Decree of mutual divorce is also attached with the petition. (Annexure P-4).

Learned counsel for the petitioners also submits that petitioners are in a live-in relationship against the wishes of respondent No. 4 to 6, and have sought protection of their lives and liberty. It is submitted that petitioner No. 1-Reena, is aged 27 years and petitioner No. 2 – Bhim Singh, is aged 44 years and they apprehend danger at the hands of private

respondents No.4 to 6, who will eliminate them, if they intend to solemnize the marriage at relevant time.

In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 6, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 04.02.2023 (Annexure P-5) to the Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, (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 advance notice, Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana, puts in appearance on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.

Since petitioners have not contracted any marriage and seek only protection qua their lives and personal liberty, and for the same already representation dated 04.02.2023 (Annexure P-5) 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 the innocence of the petitioners are 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 6.

However, factum of mutual divorce as got recorded hereinabove by petitioner No.1-Reena, would also be confirmed.

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

February 09, 2023

kavita nain

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