



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

109

CRWP-4606-2024

Date of Decision: May 18, 2024

Smt. Sonam Kumari and another

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Ajay Vijarania, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

SUDEEPTI SHARMA.J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, as filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners, who are in a 'live-in relationship', have sought issuance of directions upon the official respondents No.2 and 3, to ensure protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 7, and, also to restrain the said respondents from harassing the petitioners or interfering in their personal life.

2. The counsel for the petitioners contend that though both the petitioners have attained the age of majority, as the petitioner No.1 was born on 08.04.2002, while the petitioner No.2 was born on 04.01.2005, however, the petitioner No.2 has not attained the minimum age, as prescribed by statute, for solemnizing marriage i.e. 21 years. The petitioners have appended their respective Aadhar Cards as Annexures P-1 and P-2 with the instant petition. He further contends that since the petitioner No.2 has not yet attained the minimum age prescribed for solemnizing marriage i.e. 21 years, therefore, the petitioners have been living in 'live-in relationship'. However, their 'live-in relationship' has



caused grievance to the private respondents/family members of petitioner No.1. As a result of such grievance, the private respondents/family members of petitioner No.1 wanted to get her married with some other person against her wishes and will.

3. It is further averred in the petition, that consequently petitioner No.1 having no other alternative ran away from her house and started living with petitioner No.2. The petitioners also made a representation dated 14.05.2024 (Annexure P-3) to the respondent no.2, expressing therein their apprehension qua danger to their lives at the hands of the private respondents.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that he would be satisfied in case the respondent no.2- Superintendent of Police, Charkhi Dadri, is directed to look into the representation (supra) and after considering threat perception to the petitioners, to take appropriate action.

5. Notice of motion to the official respondent(s) only.

6. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Vishal Kashyap, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

7. Without commenting anything as regards the veracity of the averments made in the petition and also as regards the sanctity of alleged relationship of the petitioners, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petition with a direction to respondent no.2- Superintendent of Police, Charkhi Dadri, to consider the representation (supra) and to take appropriate action in accordance with law. In case, it is found that there is a genuine threat to the lives and liberty of the petitioners, then necessary steps warranted under law be taken at the earliest, so as to ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioners.

8. It is, however, clarified that this order shall not be taken to be any expression as regards the alleged relationship of the petitioners and shall not

confer any immunity upon the petitioners, in case it is found that they have committed any wrong.

9. Disposed of accordingly.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

May 18, 2024
sonia arora

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