

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

2024:PHHC:021216
CRM-M-14970 of 2019
DECIDED ON: 14.02.2024

LAXMI AND ANOTHER

....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Sanjeev K. Virk, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J.(ORAL)

Petitioners are praying for direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to provide protection to their life and liberty from the hands of private respondent No.4.

In the petition, it has been stated that both the petitioners are into live-in-relationship which has been opposed by private respondent No.4.

Counsel for the petitioners has submitted that as the petitioners are apprehending threat from the side of the aforesaid private respondent, which compelled them to give representation dated 10.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) to respondent No.2 but the police authorities failed to take any action on the basis of the said representation. Counsel for the petitioners further submitted that he will be satisfied if necessary action is taken by the authorities on the basis of the aforesaid representation.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG, Punjab accepts

POONAM SHARMA
2024.02.16 10:14
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

handed over to him during the course of the day. Learned State counsel submits that in case any such representation is pending, the concerned authority will look into the matter and take action in accordance with law.

For the aforesaid reasons, this appears to be a fit case for this Court to invoke the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. and in view of the mandate provided under Article 21 of the Constitution of India to protect the citizen's right to life and liberty.

Thus, the Senior Superintendent of Police, SAS Nagar, Mohali Punjab, is directed to consider the representation dated 10.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) and take appropriate steps to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

However, any observations made in this order will not be construed as an expression of opinion on the validity of the relationship of the petitioners. It is also made clear that respondent No.4 is at liberty to avail appropriate remedy available to him under law against the petitioners. In case the petitioners have committed any offence, law will take its own course.

The petition is disposed of with the above direction.

February 14, 2024
Poonam Sharma

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>