



CRWP-2749-2025(O&M)

1

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

CRWP-2749-2025(O&M)**Decided on :26.05.2025**

Neha and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. L.S. Mann, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Manjinder Singh Bhullar, DAG, Punjab.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. By way of filing this petition, petitioners seek protection of their lives and personal liberty, in view of the fact that they have not solemnized their marriage so far and are living in a live-in relationship and are under eminent threat at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

2. On 21.03.2025, following order was passed by this Court:

“1. By way of filing this petition, petitioners seek protection of their lives and personal liberty, in view of the fact that they have not solemnized their marriage so far and are living in a live-in relationship and are under eminent threat at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

2. It is contended that petitioner No.1 was earlier in a live in relationship with one Rahul-respondent No.6 and one child was also born out from said relationship. After breakup of the relationship with Rahul-respondent No.6, she started residing with petitioner No.2 in a live in relationship and child is also with them.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners by referring to the representation dated 13.03.2025, submits that since the time, petitioners are residing together, there has been a constant threat of killing, by the private respondents.

4. Notice of motion for 25.04.2025.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Amandeep Singh, DAG, Punjab, appears and submits that in case, such direction petitions are entertained, all matrimonial laws would be of no meaning and there would be strong chances that the run away couple, who are already married with some other person, may use the Courts' order as shield to justify their relations, which may even not be recognized under law.



6. *Be that as it may, the scope of this Court is only to examine the threat perception to the lives of the persons and not beyond that, therefore, let a status report be filed by learned State Counsel after examining the facts and circumstances in its entirety and respondent No.2 would ensure that any such incident as expressed by the petitioners do not happen till the next date of hearing.*

7. *To be heard along with CRWP-186-2025. ”*

3. Learned State Counsel submits that during the pendency of the instant petition, the statements of the parties have been duly recorded. It is further submitted that, as of now, there is no apprehension of any threat to the life and liberty of the petitioners. Due care and caution are being exercised by the concerned authorities, and in the event any threat perception arises in the future, appropriate and timely measures shall be taken by the State.

4. Learned State counsel further submits that Petitioner No.1 has returned to her matrimonial home and is no longer in a live-in relationship with Petitioner No.2. In view of the changed circumstances, there is no requirement for protection, and the present petition has been rendered infructuous.

5. In light of the above, and in view of the statements made by learned State counsel, no further directions are warranted at this stage.

Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of as infructuous.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

26.05.2025

Rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No