

**CRWP-10092-2025****-1-**

127

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH****CRWP-10092-2025****Date of Decision: 16.09.2025**

MANPREET KAUR AND ANOTHER

... PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Nishant, Advocate and
Mr. Gurmandeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of directions to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners are major and are residing together in a live-in relationship, but they apprehend threat to their life and liberty from the private respondents. While drawing the attention of this Court to representation dated 09.09.2025 (Annexure P-3), learned counsel has submitted that the matter was reported to respondent No. 2-The Senior Superintendent of Police, Fazilka seeking police protection, however, it went in vain. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioners would be satisfied if directions are issued to



CRWP-10092-2025

-2-

respondent No.2 to look into the aforesaid representation and to take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Subhash Godara, Additional Advocate General, Punjab, accepted notice on behalf of the official respondents and submitted that the competent authority will take action in accordance with law.

5. Heard.

6. In view of the above, without commenting upon the status of live-in-relationship of the petitioners, the present petition is disposed of with directions to respondent No.2 to take necessary steps, as per direction of this Court as held in ***CRWP No.4660 of 2021*** titled as ***Yash Pal and another vs. State of Haryana and others***, decided on ***09.09.2024***, whereby the protection was granted, qua the life and liberty of adults, who were in a live-in relationship, in order to protect them from threats arising from moral vigilants or from close relative of any of them. The fundamental right to life and liberty is so sacrosanct and stands at such a high pedestal that it must be protected even in the absence of an incident like solemnization of a valid marriage between the parties. However, it is made clear that if the petitioners commit any offence against the State or any person, this order shall not create any embargo or impediment to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

16.09.2025

Sima

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>