



CRWP-3948-2025(O&M)

1

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

CRWP-3948-2025(O&M)**Decided on :26.05.2025**

Jinder Kaur and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Lupil Gupta, 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 private respondents.

2. On 23.04.2025, following order was passed by this Court:

"1. Endorsing the decision of the Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana, and as a mark of respect and to mourn the sudden demise of Shri Bhupinder Singh Rathore, who was one of the oldest member of the Bar Council, the members of the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association are observing "No Work Day" today, i.e. 23.04.2025.

2. 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.5 to 10.

3. Counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 - Jinder Kaur, aged about 37 years, is already married to respondent No.5 - Gursewak Singh, who allegedly ousted petitioner No.1 from the matrimonial house. Petitioner No.2 - Rashpal Singh, aged about 24 years, is unmarried. However, both of them are residing together. Besides, there is 13 years of age gap between the petitioners.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners by referring to the representation dated 17.04.2025 submits that since the time, petitioner No.1 eloped with petitioner No.2, there has been a constant threat of killing, by the private respondents.

5. Notice of motion for 25.04.2025.



6. *Besides, it is also noticed 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.*

7. *Be that as it may, the scope of the present petition before 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.*

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

3. Learned State Counsel submits that during the pendency of the instant petition before this Court, the statements of the parties have been recorded. As of now, there is no apprehension of threat to their life and liberty. However, due care is being taken by the administration, and in case any threat perception arises in the future, appropriate measures will be taken.

4. In view of the statement made by the learned State Counsel, no specific directions are warranted at this stage. Accordingly, the petition stands disposed of.

5. However, the respondents shall ensure that, in view of the relationship between the petitioners, if any fresh complaint is received apprehending threat to their life and liberty, the necessary protection shall be provided by the State.

6. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

26.05.2025

Rashmi

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