

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-63-2024 (O&M)

Decided on:-05.01.2024

Rajveer Kaur and another

....Petitioners..

vs.

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Sarthak Jindal, Advocate for
Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

HARKESH MANUJA J. (Oral)

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

2. Upon advance notice, Mr. Chetan Sharma, DAG, Haryana appears on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3. Requisite copies of the petition have already been supplied to the respondents-State by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

3. As a matter of fact, admittedly, both the petitioners are girls. They are major and have liking for each other. They are in live-in-relationship and residing in a common accommodation.

4. It has been contended that the petitioners are well aware of the fact that their relationship is not in the nature of marriage as they belong to same sex. It has been further submitted that the petitioners are having continues threat at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 7 and in this

regard they have already submitted representation dated 21.12.2023 (Annexure P-3) 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.

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. Keeping in view the proposition of law laid down in the aforementioned cases and without expressing any opinion upon the relationship being maintained by the petitioners, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- Superintendent of Police, Sirsa District Sirsa to consider the representation dated 21.12.2023 (Annexure P-3) and assess the threat perception to the petitioners and after

considering the same, pass necessary directions to respondent No.3 in this regard.

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

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

05.01.2024
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/ No