



CRWP-9585-2024

-1-

106

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

CRWP-9585-2024

Date of Decision: October 22, 2024

Vandna and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr.S.K.Choudhary Advocate
for the petitioners.

.....

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J.(ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondents No.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and not to harass or interfere in their peaceful life being in live-in-relationship at the instance of respondents No.4 to 11 and their other family members and not to intrude into the privacy of the petitioners by raiding their house time and again.

2. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that both the petitioners were already married, however, petitioner No.2 has already taken the divorce from his wife whereas petitioner No.1 has filed the divorce petition, which is pending adjudication. He submits that both the petitioners are living together in live-in-relationship against the wishes of respondents No.4 to 11 and have sought protection to their life and liberty.

They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 11. The petitioners have

submitted a representation, dated 25.09.2024 (Annexure P-4) to respondent No.2.

3. Notice of motion to respondents no.1 to 3-State only.
4. On the asking of the Court, Mr.Tarun Aggarwal, Sr.DAG, Punjab. who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents/State.
5. Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot, District Pathankot, a to decide the representation (Annexure P-4) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived. It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order would not be understood having expressed any opinion whatsoever by this Court on the validity of their live-in-relationship.

October 22, 2024	(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
meenuss	JUDGE
1. Whether speaking/reasoned ?	Yes/No
2. Whether reportable ?	Yes/No