



CRWP-3791-2025

1

109

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-3791-2025

Date of decision: 17.04.2025

SUKHPREET SINGH AND ANR

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE **AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present: Mr. Gagandeep Kumar Tiwari, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.

AMARJOT BHATTI, J (Oral):

Petitioners Sukhpreet Singh and Subodhani have filed present petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of Mandamus, directing official respondents No.2 and 3 to protect life and liberty of petitioners by providing adequate security/police protection to the petitioners and also directing the respondents No.4 and 5 not to interfere in the personal life and liberty of the petitioners and further directing the respondents No.2 and 3 not to allow/let respondents No.4 and 5 or anybody else not to interfere with the life and liberty of the petitioners or to harass them in any manner against the wishes of the petitioners or to cause any detriment to the petitioners in any manner as the petitioners are major and are in live-in-relationship with their free will and the petitioners are being threatened by the respondents No. 4 and 5.

2. It is submitted that both petitioners are major. As per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 1, Annexure P-1, his year of birth is 2005. On the other hand, as per Aadhaar Card of petitioner No. 2, Annexure P-2, her date of birth is 05.07.2006. Petitioners also moved representation to Senior Superintendent



of Police, Ludhiana (Rural), which is Annexure P-3. Petitioners are in live-in relationship and they both decided to live together. However, they are apprehending threats to their life and liberty from the hands of respondents No.4 and 5.

- 3. Notice of motion to official respondents only.
- 4. On advance notice, Mr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra DAG, Punjab appears on behalf of official respondents. Complete copy of paperbook along with supporting documents is already supplied.
- 5. Considering nature of litigation, no purpose would be served by serving notice to private respondents.
- 6. I have considered facts narrated in petition, according to which both petitioners are major and are in live-in relationship against the wishes of family of petitioner No. 2, as a result they are apprehending threats from the hands of respondents No. 4 and 5. It is duty of police to protect life of petitioners. Therefore, respondents No. 2 and 3 are directed to consider representation of petitioners dated 02.04.2025 (Annexure P-3) and protect life of petitioners from the hands of respondents No.4 and 5, considering threat perception.
- 7. Aforesaid protection order will have no bearing on the legality of their relationship and it will not protect them in case there is any violation of law or pending legal proceedings.
- 8. Petition is accordingly disposed of.
- 9. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, stand disposed of accordingly as well.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)
JUDGE

17.04.2025

monika 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes /No
2. Whether reportable : Yes /No