

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

114

CRWP-6273-2025

Date of decision: 13.06.2025

SANJOLI

....PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS


CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. B.S. Makar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. The petitioner has approached this Court for issuance of necessary directions for protecting their life and liberties which according to them are at stake because they are in a live-in-relationship. The petitioner claim themselves to be major in terms of age. According to the copy of the Aadhar Card (Annexure P-1), the date of birth of the petitioner-Sanjoli is 08.07.2005.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a marriage is not a must for providing security to a couple in a 'live-in-relationship' because protection qua life and liberty is sacrosanct and stands at the highest pedestal. He has also placed reliance upon orders passed by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court in '*Sarabjeet Kaur and another versus State of Punjab and others*' in CRWP-102-2022 decided on 07.01.2022; '*Goutam Kumar and another versus State of Punjab and others*' in CRWP-8088-2021 decided on 26.08.2021; *Bharti and Another Versus State of U.T.,*



Chandigarh & others and '*Annu Rani & Anr. vs. State of Haryana*' in CRWP-11060-2023 decided on 15.11.2023.

3. Notice of motion to respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (i.e. official respondents).

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Aashish Bishnoi, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

5. At this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case as well as on the age and nature of the relationship between the petitioner; I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No. 2 (Senior Superintendent of Police, Hisar) to look into the matter and pass an appropriate order on the representation stated to have been filed by the petitioner before him/her on 09.06.2025 (Annexure P-3) & pass appropriate orders thereupon within two weeks from today.

6. However, if the petitioner is found to have been involved in any other case, then this order shall not preclude the competent authority from taking lawful action against the petitioner.

7. The petition stands disposed off. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

June 13, 2025
jatin

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No