

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

213

**CRWP-11601-2022 (O&M)
Decided on : 17.01.2023**

Baljit Kaur and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Prince Sarangal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Raman Mohinder Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No. 4.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Order dated 12.12.2022 passed by this Court says as under:

“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.

Petitioner No.1 (Baljit Kaur), aged about 46 years, is already stated to be married with respondent No.4 – Makhan Singh. But, due to atrocities caused by respondent No.4 i.e. husband of petitioner No.1, disputes between both of them have arisen, and at present, petitioner No.1 is in a live-in relationship with petitioner No.2, with a purpose to restart her life.

While arguing, counsel for the petitioners also submits that though details are not mentioned in the petition, yet it is a matter of fact that petitioner No.1 has already given birth to four children.

Counsel for the petitioners further submits that petitioners being in a live-in relationship, are

apprehensive of their lives at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 6.

Notice of motion for 17.01.2023.

On asking of the Court, Mr. JS Arora, DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 (State).

Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be supplied to learned State counsel during course of the day.

Remaining respondents be served through dasti process as well.

However, this Court is not inclined to make any observation in regard to the relations between the parties, but at the same time prayer of protection qua lives of the petitioners cannot be ignored. Therefore, respondent No.2 – Commissioner of Police, District Jalandhar, is directed to look into the representation dated 16.11.2022 (Annexure P-3) , and if any truth is found in the averments, an appropriate action in accordance with law for safeguarding the lives of the petitioners would be taken.”

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

Dismissed as withdrawn.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

17.01.2023

Riya

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