

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

205

**CRWP-9817-2022 (O&M)
Decided on : 16.03.2023**

Poonam and another . . . Petitioner(s)
Versus
State of Punjab and others . . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Parveen Chauhan, Advocate for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

On 18.01.2023, when the matter was taken up for hearing following order was passed by this Court:-

“Present petition is for seeking protection to the lives and liberty on the ground that petitioners are living in a live-in relationship.

Learned State counsel points out that petitioner No.2 is already married with respondent No.4, and there are two minor children, out of this wedlock. Said fact is also mentioned in the present petition in paragraph Nos.3 & 4, which are reproduced herein-below:-

“3. That the petitioner No.1 after completing her education is working on a hair transplant clinic, Amritsar due to financial constraints and poor condition of her family. The petitioner No.2 visited the clinic of petitioner No.1 about one year ago for his hair transplantation. At the first meeting of the petitioner, the petitioner No.2 told that he is already married with Jyoti and having two children. However, despite that the petitioner No.1 fell in love with the petitioner No.2. Though the petitioner No.2 refrained himself from any such relation, but the petitioner No.1 is ready to live-in with the petitioner No.2 with her free will and volition.

4. That the family members of the petitioner No.1 is having no objection in case the petitioner No.1 live-in with petitioner No.2. However, the first wife of the petitioner No.2 is having reservation against any such extra-marital relation of the petitioner, thus, she is continuously designing and intimidating for the elimination of the petitioners.”

In view of above, matter is adjourned to enable the counsel for the petitioners to seek instructions from petitioner No.2 that how much amount, he would be ready to deposit for his two minor children, and his

*wife i.e. respondent No.4, as financial security for their future prospects.
Adjourned to 22.02.2023 ”*

At the very outset, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the present petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

16.03.2023

Riya

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