



CRWP-7212-2024

-1-

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

108

CRWP-7212-2024

Date of Decision:- 30.07.2024

**Sharmila and Anr.**

....Petitioners

Vs.

**State of Haryana and Ors.**

...Respondents

**CORAM:-HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present:- Mr. J.P.Dhull, Advocate for petitioners.

Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI, J.**

1. Petitioners Sharmila and Vishal have filed present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to official respondents No. 2 & 3 to protect life and liberty of petitioners from the hands of respondents No.4 to 6 as they are in live-in relationship with their own sweet will.

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. Petitioner No.1 is aged about 32 years, copy of her aadhar card is Annexure P-1. She is a married woman having two children who are residing with her husband (respondent No.4). Petitioner No. 2 is aged about 19 years, copy of his aadhar card is Annexure P-2. They are in live-in relationship. Petitioners also moved representation to Superintendent of Police, Hisar dated 23.07.2024 which is Annexure P-3. Petitioners are apprehending threat from respondent No.4 who is husband of petitioner No.1 and from respondents No.5 and 6.

3. After interacting both petitioners, who are present in Court, it is

**CRWP-7212-2024****-2-**

disclosed that petitioner No.2 is actually 18 ½ years old whereas his age in the petition has been mentioned as 19 years.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On asking of this Court, Mr. Rupinder Singh Jhand, Addl. A.G., Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State. Complete copy of paperbook along with supporting documents is already supplied.

6. Considering the nature of litigation no purpose would be served by serving notice to private respondent.

7. I have considered facts narrated in the petition, according to which both petitioners are major and are in live-in relationship, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No.4 to 6. It is duty of police to protect life of petitioners. Therefore, respondents No. 2 & 3 are directed to consider representation of petitioners dated 23.07.2024 (Annexure P-3) and considering threat perception if any, pass appropriate orders.

8. Aforesaid protection order will have no bearing on the legality of their relationship and it will not protect them in case there is any violation of law or pending legal proceedings.

9. Petition is accordingly disposed of.

10. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

**30.07.2024***Sunil Devi***(AMARJOT BHATTI)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:  
Whether reportable:

Yes/No  
Yes/No