



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH
(107)

CRWP No. 10889 of 2024
Date of decision : 12.11.2024

Daman Preet Kaur @ Damnpreet Kaur and another
.....Petitioners

vs.

State of Haryana and others
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Petitioners in person with Mr. Rakesh Bakshi, Advocate

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

...

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondents No. 1 to 3 to protect life and personal liberty of the petitioners and not to harass or interfere in the peaceful life of the petitioners at the instance of respondents No. 4 to 6.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that both the petitioners are major and are living in live-in relationship against the wishes of private respondents. It is further submitted that the petitioners apprehend danger from respondents no.4 to 6. The petitioners have submitted a representation dated 07.11.2024 (Annexure P-3) to respondent no.2 for granting protection to their life and liberty.



3. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.
4. Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the State.
5. Both the petitioners are present in person.
6. The Court has interacted with both the petitioners and parents of petitioner No.1, who are also present in the Court. Petitioner No.1- Damanpreet Kaur has submitted that she is in relationship with petitioner No.2 and her marriage has been fixed by her parents against her wishes. Hence she has decided to stay in live-in-relationship with petitioner No.2. She apprised the Court that she has complete trust on petitioner No.2, but as her parents are opposing her relationship with petitioner No.2, they have threat to their lives and liberty.
7. The parents of petitioner No.1, who are present, have apprised the Court that marriage of their daughter i.e. petitioner No.1 was fixed with her consent. The mother has also apprised the Court that whole purchasing of the marriage was done by petitioner No.1 with her free will. They have submitted that the marriage cards have already been distributed by the family and their daughter i.e. petitioner No.1, has also distributed the wedding cards to her friends. They have also submitted that she never disclosed to her parents about her relationship with petitioner No.2 and if she had disclosed the same, they would have not fixed her marriage as already fixed.
8. Petitioner No.2 has submitted before the Court that he is ITI qualified and he would marry petitioner No.1. He submitted that as on date, he is not of the marriageable age, hence they are living in live-in-



relationship. He has submitted that he would be responsible in case he violates his undertaking.

9. Heard.

10. 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-Superintendent of Police, Yamuna Nagar, to decide the representation (Annexure P-3) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived.

11. 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.

12.11.2024
chugh

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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