



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

142

CRWP-2984-2025

Date of Decision: 26.03.2025

Soniya and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA

Present: Mr. Karan Choudhary, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SUDEEPTI SHARMA.J. (ORAL)

1. Through the instant petition, as filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the petitioners, who are in a 'live-in relationship', have sought issuance of directions upon the official respondents No.2 and 3, to ensure protection of their lives and liberty at the hands of private respondent No.4, and, also to restrain the said respondent from harassing the petitioners or interfering in their personal life.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that though both the petitioners have attained the age of majority, as the petitioner No.1 was born on 10.11.1992, while the petitioner No.2 was born on 02.04.1988, as prescribed by statute, for solemnizing marriage i.e. 21 years. The petitioners have appended their respective Aadhar Cards as Annexures P-1 and P-2 with the instant petition. He further contends that since both the petitioners have attained the minimum age prescribed for solemnizing marriage i.e. 21 years, therefore, the petitioners have been living in 'live-in relationship'. However,



their 'live-in relationship' has caused grievance to the private respondent/family member of petitioner No.2. As a result of such grievance, the private respondent/family member of petitioner No.2 wanted to kill both the petitioners.

3. It is further averred in the petition, that consequently both the petitioners having no other alternative other than ran away from their houses and started living with together. The petitioners also made a representation dated 19.03.2025 (Annexure P-3) to the respondent No.2, expressing therein their apprehension qua danger to their lives at the hands of the private respondent.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that he would be satisfied in case respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur, is directed to look into the representation (supra) and after considering threat perception to the petitioners, to take appropriate action.

5. Notice of motion to the official respondent(s) only.

6. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Jasjeet Singh Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

7. Without commenting anything as regards the veracity of the averments made in the petition and also as regards the sanctity of alleged relationship of the petitioners, this Court deems it appropriate to dispose of the present petition with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Gurdaspur, to consider the representation (supra) and to take appropriate action in accordance with law. In case, it is found that there is a genuine threat to the lives and liberty of the petitioners, then



necessary steps warranted under law be taken at the earliest, so as to ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioners.

8. It is, however, clarified that this order shall not be taken to be any expression as regards the alleged relationship of the petitioners and shall not confer any immunity upon the petitioners, in case it is found that they have committed any wrong.

9. Disposed of accordingly.

(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)
JUDGE

26.03.2025
Virrendra

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