



CRWP-9276-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(239)

CRWP-9276-2024
Date of Decision : 02.12.2024

Sekha Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present: None for the petitioners.

Ms. Avneet Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J.(ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, as cast under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a writ, in the nature of mandamus, directing the respondents No.2 and 3, to protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners, at the instance of private respondents No.4 to 7.
2. This Court, on dated 23.09.2024, had passed the hereinafter extracted order, upon the instant petition :-

“Both the parties are married and have decided to walk out from their earlier matrimonial relationship and started living in a “Live-inRelationship”, have filed the instant petition seeking mandamus upon the official respondents, to protect their life and liberty.

Notice of motion for 22.10.2024.

In the meanwhile, the wife of petitioner No.2, namely, Sandeep Kaur d/o Heera Singh, resident of Mianwind, Tehsil and District Tarn Taran is impleaded as respondent No.8 in the array of the respondents.

Learned counsel for the petitioners undertakes to file the amended memo of parties before the Registry of this Court.

Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, DAG, Punjab, waives service on behalf



of the respondent-State.
Notice be issued to the respondents No.4 to 7 and also to newly added respondent for the date fixed on furnishing of requisite process fee.”

3. In deference to the directions issued by this Court, by drawing an order dated 23.09.2024, short reply dated 19.10.2024, by way of an affidavit of Mr. Arun Sharma, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Baba Bakala Sahib, District Amritsar (Rural), on behalf of the respondents No.1 to 3, furnished by the learned State counsel, today in the Court. The same is taken on the record.
4. The study survey of the reply (supra), reflects that the petitioner No.1, has got recorded her statement to the effect that she is living in a ‘live-in relationship’, with petitioner No.2, and she has no threat perceptions, as on today, from the private respondents No.4 to 7.
5. Today, no one has caused appearance on behalf of the petitioners. It seems that there is no threat perception to the petitioners, and they do not want to pursue the instant petition.
6. In view of the specific reply (supra), and the statement suffered by the petitioner No.1, no further order is required to be passed in the instant petition, and the same is hereby **closed**.
7. **Disposed of** accordingly.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

December 02, 2024
Manpreet

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