



111

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

**CRWP-5103-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 21.05.2025**

Parveen and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN

Present: Ms. Pushpinder Kaur, Advocate for the petitioners.

HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN, J. (Oral)

CRM-W-716-2025

Application is allowed as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions and Annexure P-5 & P-6 are taken on record.

Main case

[1] The prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, *inter alia*, is for issuance of direction to respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 6, who are in a live-in relationship against the wishes of private respondents.

[2] The learned counsel for the petitioners contends that both the petitioners are major, but age of petitioner No.2 is 20 years and 07 months and he has not yet attained the age of marriage. As such, both the petitioners are living together and they have decided to solemnize marriage as and when petitioner No.2 attains majority. Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that parents of petitioner No.1 are interfering in their relationship and are threatening them of



dire consequences. The petitioners feeling imminent danger to their life and liberty, submitted a written representation dated 14.05.2025 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2, but till date no police protection has been provided to the petitioners and they are facing constant threat from the private respondent Nos.4 to 6.

[3] Notice of motion.

[4] On the asking of the Court, Mr. Aashish Bishnoi, DAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3. Learned State counsel has confirmed that representation (Annexure P-3) has not been received by them, however, FIR No.77 dated 15.05.2025 under Section 127(6) of the BNS, 2023, Police Station Panjokhara, District Ambala, was registered at the instance of petitioner No.1. Learned State counsel has confirmed that petitioner No.1 is major and her date of birth is 14.02.2003 as per her Birth Certified issued by the Registrar of Births and Deaths, Health Department, Haryana. Learned State counsel has also submitted that statements of respondent Nos.4 to 6 were recorded and they have no objection regarding the relationship *inter se* the petitioners.

[5] The Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in "***Yash Pal and another vs. State of Haryana and others***", bearing CRWP-4660-2021, CRWP-149-2024 and LPA-968-2021 (O&M), decided on 09.09.2024, formulated various questions for decision, including the following question:-

"6. xxxxxxxxxxxx

1. Where two persons living together seek protection of their life and liberty by filing an appropriate petition, whether the Court is



required to grant them protection, per se, without examining their marital status and the other circumstances of that case?

2. xxxxxxxxxxxx”

[6] While relying upon the decision of the Hon’ble Apex Court in *“S. Khushboo vs. Kanniammal and another”*, (2010) 5 Supreme Court Cases 600; *“Nandakumar and another vs. State of Karala and others”*, (2018) 16 Supreme Court Cases 602; *“Shafin Jahan vs. Ashokan K.M. and others”*, (2018) 16 Supreme Court Cases 368; and *“Soni Gerry vs. Gerry Douglas”*, (2018) 2 Supreme Court Cases 197, the Hon’ble Division Bench of this Court held that *qua* adults in a live-in relationship for warding off threats arising from moral vigilants or from the close relatives or any of them, protection is required to be granted. While affirming the view taken by some of the Single Benches of this Court in various decisions, it was held as under:-

*“For the reasons to be assigned hereinafter the judgments (supra) rendered by the Apex Court, and, the judgments rendered by Full Benches of this Court in LPA No. 1678 of 2014 and in LPA No. 769 of 2021, besides the verdicts (supra) rendered by this Court, whereby *qua* adults in a live-in relationship, thus the espoused protection but for warding off threats arising from moral vigilants or from the close relatives of any of them, has been granted, thus are required to be affirmed. On the other hand, the verdicts (supra) whereby the espoused claim for protection to the adults in a live-in relationship, has been denied, thus are respectfully disagreed with.”*

[7] At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are still facing threats from respondent Nos.4 to 6.



[8] In view of this, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the petitioners to approach the Police authorities and upon doing so, respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Panchkula, shall look into the representation dated 14.05.2025, *qua* threat perception and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that life and liberty of petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents.

[9] This order may not be construed as an opinion regarding validity of the relationship *inter se* the petitioners.

[10] Further, it is made clear that if any of the averments made in the petition is found to be incorrect, specifically with regard to age of the petitioners or the petitioners being in any prohibited relationship to each other, or as regards their previous marital status, this order shall not be construed to be a bar on proceedings to be initiated as per law.

[11] Pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of.

21.05.2025

atulsethi

[HARPREET KAUR JEEWAN]
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned :

Yes No

Whether Reportable :

Yes No