

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

CRWP- 3571 -2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: April 17, 2023

Tania and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

**Present: Mr. Vishal Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioners.**

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. 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 and 5.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are in a live-in relationship against the wishes of respondents No. 4 and 5 and have sought protection to their lives and liberty. It is submitted that petitioner No. 1-Tania, is aged about 18 years and petitioner No. 2 – Rajdeep Singh, is aged about 19 years are thus, majors, but petitioner No. 2 is not of marriageable age, being of 19 years and have not performed marriage, but they are in a live-in relationship and they apprehend danger at the hands of private respondents No. 4 and 5, who will eliminate them. At the very outset, Counsel for the petitioners submits that in the memo of parties, Respondent No. 2 has been wrongly mentioned as Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala, District Fazilka instead of Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, District Fazilka.

3. In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No. 4 and 5 petitioners have allegedly moved a representation dated 11.04.2023, (Annexure P-3), to Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka, Punjab (respondent No. 2), wherein, all the apprehension to their lives have been expressed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of the Court, Mr. J. S. Arora, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (State).
6. Since petitioners have not contracted any marriage and seek only protection *qua* their lives and personal liberty, and for the same already representation dated 11.04.2023 (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.
7. 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. 4 and 5.
8. 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.
9. Petition stands **disposed of** accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

April 17, 2023

Riya

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

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**