



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

CRWP No.3512 of 2025

Date of decision: 8th April, 2025

Lovepreet Kaur & another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present: Mr. Krishan Kanha, Advocate for the petitioner.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J.

1. The petitioners have approached this Court seeking protection of their life and liberty, alleging a threat from private respondents, who are the parents and uncle of petitioner No.1.

2. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioners that they are in a live-in relationship, with petitioner No.1 residing with petitioner No.2 out of her own volition. It is further asserted that the relationship between the petitioners is consensual.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 left with petitioner No.2 on 20.01.2025 and travelled to Bihar. Upon their return to Mansa in March 2025, the private respondents allegedly disapproved of their relationship and issued threats of dire consequences. In this regard, a representation dated 27.03.2025

(Annexure P-3) was submitted to the official respondents, but no action has been taken yet.

4. At the very outset, a specific query was put to learned counsel for the petitioners regarding the age of petitioner No.1. Learned counsel, in response, unequivocally submitted that petitioner No.1 is a minor, aged 16 years. On a further query as to whether any complaint or FIR has been registered against petitioner No.2 in relation to the alleged elopement or missing of petitioner No.1, learned counsel submitted that a complaint had indeed been made by the private respondents.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the relevant material on record.

6. On the admitted facts, it is undisputed that petitioner No.1 was a minor when she left her home in January 2025 and began cohabiting with petitioner No.2. It is further conceded by learned counsel for the petitioners that a complaint stands lodged against petitioner No.2 in connection with the disappearance of petitioner No.1. Although, learned counsel for the petitioners feigns ignorance regarding the registration of an FIR, the fact remains that petitioner No.1, being a minor, was incapable in law of giving valid consent to the relationship with petitioner No.2.

7. This Court finds it necessary to reiterate that any alleged consent by a minor, in circumstances such as the present, is legally irrelevant and devoid of sanctity. The continued stay of petitioner No.1 with petitioner No.2, being a minor, cannot be accorded legal protection.

The pendency of a complaint, and the strong likelihood of registration of an FIR against petitioner No.2, further militates against the grant of any relief. Accordingly, the instant petition, being devoid of any merit, stands dismissed in limine.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

April 8, 2025

rps

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