



CRWP-4847-2025

- 1 -

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

143

CRWP-4847-2025

Decided on : 12.05.2025

Sneha and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Sankalp Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. J.S. Kang, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. By way of filing this petition, petitioners seek necessary 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, as petitioner No.2 is not of marriageable age, and are under eminent threat at the hands of respondents No.4 to 9.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are in a live-in relationship against the wishes of respondent No. 4 to 9, and have sought protection to their life and liberty. It is submitted that petitioner No. 1 – Sneha, is aged about 19 years and petitioner No. 2 – Mohit, is aged about 18 years, and they apprehend danger at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 9, who will eliminate them if they intend to solemnize the marriage at relevant time.

3. In the context of threat perception at the hands of private respondents No.4 to 9, petitioners have allegedly moved representation dated 05.05.2025 (Annexure P-4), to the Superintendent of Police, Panipat (respondent No.2), wherein, all the apprehensions *qua* their lives and liberty has been expressed.

4. Notice of motion.

5. On advance notice, Mr. Kanwar Sanjiv Kumar, AAG, Haryana,



CRWP-4847-2025

- 2 -

puts in appearance on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3 (State).

6. Since, petitioners have not contracted any marriage and seek only protection *qua* their lives and personal liberty, and for the same already representation dated 05.05.2025 (Annexure P-4) is pending, it would be appropriate to direct respondent No. 2 to have a fair look to the said representation, on the grievance of the petitioners in order to ascertain veracity of allegations made by them.

7. Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his/her own mechanism to ascertain the truth. He/she would also be at liberty to join the petitioners or any other person acquainted with facts in issue. If the innocence of the petitioners is established, then respondent No.2 shall proceed to take appropriate action in order to protect lives and personal liberty of the petitioners from being invaded by private respondents No.4 to 9.

8. The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without meaning anything on the status of the parties on the basis of live-in relationship and age of petitioners. Respondent No.2 would consider and pass necessary order without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded herein-above.

9. Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 12, 2025

J.Ram

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