

2025:PHHC:060712



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

113

CRWP-4723-2025

Decided on:08.05.2025

Amanpreet Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Rajesh Bhardwaj

Present: Mr. Suraj Kaundal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate,
for respondent no.4.

Rajesh Bhardwaj, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners have filed the present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondent nos.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of respondents No.4 to 13, who are harassing and threatening the petitioners to eliminate them in order to save their prestige in the society.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that both the petitioners are major and married and petitioner no.2 is also having one child with her wedlock with respondent no.4 Beant Singh, who is presently residing with petitioner no.2. However, both the petitioners are presently not residing with their respective spouse and are living together in live-in relationship against the wishes of private respondents. It is further submitted that the petitioners apprehend danger from respondent nos.4 to 13. The petitioners have submitted a representation dated 05.05.2025 (Annexure P-5) to respondent no.2 for granting protection to their life and liberty.
3. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

2025:PHHC:060712



4. Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Addl. A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

5. Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent no.2- Commissioner of Police, Ludhiana, to decide the representation (Annexure P-5) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived.

6. It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order would not be understood having expressed any opinion whatsoever by this Court on the validity of their live-in relationship.

May 08, 2025
vinod*

(Rajesh Bhardwaj)
Judge

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