

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH.**

CRWP-2237-2024

Date of Decision:-11.03.2024

Muskan & Anr.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana & Ors.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASJIT SINGH BEDI

Present:- Mr. Deepak Kumar Bartia, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Additional Advocate General,
Haryana.

JASJIT SINGH BEDI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have approached this Court for issuance of necessary directions to official respondents for protecting their lives and liberties which according to them are at stake because they are in a live-in-relationship. Both the petitioners claims themselves to be major. According to the copies of the Aadhar Cards (Annexure P-1 and P-2), the exact date of birth of the petitioner No.1 is 13.11.2005 and the date of birth of the petitioner No.2 is 13.01.2003.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a marriage is not a must for providing security to a couple in a 'live-in-relationship' because protection qua life and liberty is sacrosanct and stands at the highest pedestal. He has also placed reliance upon orders passed by the co-ordinate

Bench of this Court in '*Sarabjeet Kaur and another versus State of Punjab*

and others’ in CRWP-102-2022 decided on 07.01.2022, ‘*Goutam Kumar and another versus State of Punjab and others*’ in CRWP-8088-2021 decided on 26.08.2021 and *Bharti and Another Versus State of U.T., Chandigarh & others*,.

Notice of motion to respondents No. 1 to 3.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Additional Advocate General Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. Since no order prejudicial to the interest of the parties is being passed, therefore, there is no necessity of inviting any response.

At this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, as well as on the age and nature of the relationship between the petitioners, I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, District Ambala, Haryana to look into the matter and pass an appropriate order on the representation allegedly filed by the petitioners before him on 06.03.2024 (Annexure P-5). It would be appreciated if necessary orders are passed within one month from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

However, if the petitioners are found to have been involved in any other case then this order shall not preclude the competent authority from taking lawful action against the petitioners.

Disposed of.

(JASJIT SINGH BEDI)
JUDGE

March 11, 2024
Vinay

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