

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

Neutral Citation No. **2024:PHHC:027659**
CRWP-1859-2024

Date of Decision: February 28, 2024

Vickey and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Union Territory Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

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

DEEPAK GUPTA, J.(Oral)

Petitioners are living in a live-in relationship. They feel threat to their life and liberty on the part of private respondents and so have approached this Court to provide them necessary protection.

2. It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioner No.2 has not attained the age of marriage, as per Hindu Marriage Act and after attaining the age of 21 years, both the petitioners will marry each other.

3. Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 3 only.

4. Mr. Anupam Bansal, APP for U.T., Chandigarh accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3-State. Copy of paper book be supplied to him during the course of day.

5. Learned counsel for U.T., Chandigarh submits that as per the statement made by respondent No.4 – Manoj, the brother of petitioner No.2 – Soniya, the two petitioners have performed marriage, despite the fact that they are cousins in relation. However, it is a categoric stand of both the petitioners and as stated by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioner are living in a live-in-relationship and they have not performed any marriage.

6. Present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent Nos.2 and 3 to provide necessary protection to the petitioners after assessing threat perception to their life.

Disposed of.

February 28, 2024	(DEEPAK GUPTA)
sarita	JUDGE
Whether reasoned/speaking:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No