



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

119

CRWP-4404-2025
Decided on: 01.05.2025

SANDHYA PANDEY AND ANOTHER
.....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Siddharth Gulati, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana,
(appeared on advance notice)

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By filing present petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberty in view of the fact that **they are living in a live-in relationship** and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondent Nos.3 to 5.

PARTICULARS OF PETITIONERS:

Petitioner No.	Name & parantage	DoB or Age
1.	Sandhya	18 years
2.	Sachin Kumar	19 years

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though, both the petitioners are major, but petitioner No.2, being not of marriageable age, are living in a live-in relationship against the wishes of their family members, who are threatening and interfering in the life of the petitioners. Hence, the petitioners are seeking protection in that regard and have approached this Court by way of filing the instant petition. They have also submitted a representation dated 22.04.2025 (Annexure P-3),



to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

4. On asking of the Court, learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent – State. Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be supplied to learned State counsel during course of the day.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, to look into the representation dated 22.04.2025 (Annexure P-3), *qua* threat perception, and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents.

6. However, this direction will not validate the live-in status between the petitioners and will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

01.05.2025
Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES/NO
Whether Reportable: YES/NO