



CRWP-11686-2024

-1-

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

CRWP-11686-2024

Date of Decision: 04.12.2024

Jashanpreet Kaur and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Cyrus Chauhan, Advocate for
Mr. Karandeep Singh, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (ORAL)

1. Present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to the official respondents, especially, in the nature of mandamus to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the private respondents.

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 13. He submits that petitioner No.1 is earlier married with respondent No.4 and as he was alcoholic and used to beat her, she left his company and now living with petitioner No.2 in live-in-relationship. He submits that the petitioners have threat from respondents No.4 to 13 and thus, representation 28.11.2024 (Annexure P-3) has been filed to respondent No.2 for granting protection to their life and liberty.

3. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

4. Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the State. However, on instructions from ASI Raj Singh, he has

submitted that statement of petitioner No.1, Jashanpreet Kaur has been recorded and she has submitted that there is no threat to her life and liberty.

5. However, counsel for the petitioners has submitted that as petitioner No.1 is married, there is a threat to the petitioners.

6. In view of the statement made before the Police by petitioner No.1, the present petition is disposed of. However, liberty is granted to the petitioners to approach respondent No.2 for the protection of life and liberty, in case of any threat to them and in that case respondent No.2 would ensure their protection as per requirement.

04.12.2024		(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
sharmila		JUDGE
	Whether Speaking/Reasoned	: Yes/No
	Whether Reportable	: Yes/No