

2023:PHHC:144752

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

111

CRWP-11090-2023

Date of Decision : November 15, 2023

MANVEER AND ANOTHER

-Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: Mr. Amit Kashyap, Advocate
for the petitioners.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, as filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners, who are in a 'live-in relationship', have sought issuance of directions upon the respondents No.1 to 3, to ensure protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 9, and, also to restrain the said respondents from harassing the petitioners or interfering in their personal life.

2. The petitioners, in their asking for the relief (supra), have made submissions that both of them have attained the age of majority, as the petitioner No.1 was born 01.01.2002, while the petitioner No.2 was born on 18.01.2004. Though the petitioner No.1 has appended his Aadhar Card with the instant petition as Annexure P-1, however, no document, except the self-suffered affidavit of petitioner No.2, has been enclosed with the petition in support of age proof of the petitioner No.2, on the premise, that all her documents are in the custody of private respondents.

3. The further submissions, as made in the instant petition, are that the petitioners have been living in 'live-in relationship'. However, their 'live-in relationship' has caused grievance to the private respondents. As a result of such grievance, the private respondents have threatened to kill the petitioners, which has made them apprehensive of danger to their lives and liberty and resultantly, has constrained them to approach this Court, to seek protection of their lives and liberty.

4. It is further averred in the petition, that consequent upon threats being extended by the private respondents, the petitioners made a representation dated 08.11.2023 (Annexure P-4) to the respondent no.2, expressing therein their apprehension qua danger to their lives at the hands of the private respondents.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that he would be satisfied in case the respondent no.2-Commissioner of Police, Panchkula, is directed to look into the representation (supra) and after considering threat perception to the petitioners, to take appropriate action.

6. Notice of motion to the official respondent(s) only.

7. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Chetan Sharma, D.A.G., Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

8. Without commenting anything as regards the veracity of the averments made in the petition and also as regards the sanctity of alleged relationship of the petitioners, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petition with a direction to respondent no.2-Commissioner of Police, Panchkula, to consider the representation (supra) and to assess the threat perception to the petitioners and after considering the same,

respondent No.2 shall take appropriate action in accordance with law. In case, it is found that there is a genuine threat to the lives and liberty of the petitioners, then necessary steps warranted under law be taken at the earliest, so as to ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioners.

9. It is, however, clarified that this order shall not be taken to be any expression as regards the alleged relationship of the petitioners and shall not confer any immunity upon the petitioners, in case it is found that they have committed any wrong.

10. Disposed of accordingly.

November 15, 2023

devinder

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether Reportable

:

:

Yes/No

Yes/No

(KULDEEP TIWARI)

JUDGE