



111

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRWP-9135-2024**

Date of Decision: 19.09.2024

Pankaj Kumar and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURBIR SINGH**Present:** Mr. Vishal Khatri, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Manjot Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

GURBIR SINGH, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking a direction to respondents Nos.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 and 5 and not to interfere in their personal lives.
2. It is stated that date of birth of petitioner No.1 is 01.01.1987 and date of birth of petitioner No.2 is 01.01.1996. The Aadhar cards of petitioner No.1 and 2 are attached as Annexure P-1 and P-2 respectively.
3. The petitioner No.2 is a widow and having four children. After the death of her husband, her in-laws refused to provide any support to her. Petitioner No.1 is married but is residing separately from his wife since 2016. Petitioner No.1 agreed to take care of the children of the petitioner. So, unable to perform marriage with each other. The petitioners decided to live together in live-in-relationship and due to regular threats the petitioners are running here and there.
4. The private respondent Nos.4 and 5 are against the relationship of petitioners and harassing the petitioners and threatened the petitioners to face the dire consequences.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners has also submitted 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 and ‘*Goutam Kumar and another versus State of Punjab and others*’ in CRWP-8088-2021 decided on 26.08.2021.

6. Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3.

7. On asking of the Court, 1 to 3 appears and accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents No.1 to 3. Since no order prejudicial to the interest of the parties is being passed, therefore, there is no necessity of inviting any response.

8. 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 petitioner No.1 and petitioner No.2, I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, SAS Nagar to look into the matter and pass an appropriate order in the representation allegedly filed by the petitioners before him on 11.09.2024 (Annexure P-3). It would be appreciated if necessary orders are passed within one month from the date of receipt of copy of this order. Till then, protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

9. However, if the petitioners is 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.

10. Disposed of.

19.09.2024

Parveen kumar

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

(GURBIR SINGH)
JUDGE