

114

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

**CRWP-11923-2023**

**Decided on:-11.12.2023**

Kajal and another

....Petitioners..

vs.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents.

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present: Mr. Deepak, Advocate for  
Mr. Subhash Kumar, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Krishan K. Chahal, Addl. A.G., Haryana,  
for respondents No.1 to 3.

Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate,  
for respondent No.4.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA J.**

1. Present criminal writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed for issuance of direction to respondents No.2 and 3 so as to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

2. As per contents made in the petition along with the documents attached, it appears that the petitioners are stated to be in a “Live in Relationship”.

3. It has been contended that petitioner No.1 is in live-in-relationship out of her own free wish and will and without there being any threat at the hands of petitioner No.2. It has been further submitted that the petitioners are having continues threat at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 10 and in this regard they have already submitted representation

dated 06.12.2023 (Annexure P-5) to respondents No.2 and 3. It has also been contended that despite there being a continues threat to the life and liberty of the petitioners, at the hands of private respondents, the official respondents have failed to take any action in this regard.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners also relies upon the two decisions rendered by this Court in the case of “Shilpa and another Vs. State of Punjab and others” passed in CRWP-10101-2021 on 22.10.2021 and “Pardeep Singh and another Vs. State of Haryana” passed in CRWP No.4521 of 2021 (O&M) on 18.05.2021. The relevant paragraph No.6 from Pardeep Singh and another's case (Supra) is reproduced as under for reference:

*“6.Let us examine the issue from another view-point. The Constitutional Courts grant protection to couples, who have married against the wishes of their respective parents. They seek protection of life and liberty from their parents and family members, who disapprove of the alliance. An identical situation exists where the couple has entered into a live-in-relationship. The only difference is that the relationship is not universally accepted. Would that make any difference? In my considered opinion, it would not. The couple fears for their safety from relatives in both situations and not from the society. They are thus, entitled to the same relief. No citizen can be permitted to take law in his own hands in a country governed by Rule of Law.”*

5. Today, this Court passed the following order:-

*“Present criminal writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondents No.2 and 3 so as to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.*

*Notice of motion.*

*Upon advance notice, Mr. Krishan K. Chahal, Addl. A.G., Haryana appears on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3.*

*Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.4. He states that there is possibility of amicable settlement.*

*Since, the petitioners besides their elders (some of the*

*private respondents) are present in Court, thus, the matter be placed before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court today itself i.e. 11.12.2023.*

*Let report be furnished by 4:00 p.m.”*

6. In pursuance of aforesaid order, a report of even date has been received, in which, it has been mentioned that the parties have settled their dispute by way of amicable settlement/agreement, which has been reduced into writing and even signed by the petitioners as well as respondent No.5.

7. Though, the parties have settled their dispute before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court, however, considering the age of the petitioners and the relationship being maintained by them, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Kaithal to consider the representation dated 06.12.2023 (Annexure P-5) and assess the threat perception to the petitioners and after considering the same, pass necessary directions to respondent No.3 in this regard.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Writ Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid manner.

9. It is, however, clarified that this order shall not debar the State from proceedings against the petitioners, if involved in any other case.

11.12.2023  
sonika

**(HARKESH MANUJA)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:  
Whether reportable:

Yes/No  
Yes/ No