



237 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-12618-2024

Date of decision: 21.01.2025

BHARTI AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Bhawnesh Lakhera, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India for grant of protection to the petitioners, who are claiming themselves to be living in a live-in-relationship, however, could not solemnize marriage, as petitioner No. 2 (boy) has not yet attained the age of marriage.

2. On 31.12.2024, the following order was passed :

“The present petition is for grant of protection to the petitioners, who are claiming themselves to be living in a live-in-relationship, however, could not solemnize marriage, as petitioner No. 2 (boy) has not yet attained the age of marriage.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, Asst. A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3/State. Respondents No. 4 to 7 be served through dasti notices for the date fixed.

In addition to the above, the concerned SHO under whose jurisdiction respondents No. 4 to 7 resides shall also inform respondents No.4 to 7 to be present in Court on the date fixed.

Since, the petitioners are living in a live-in relationship, hence, the petitioners as well as respondents No. 4 to 7 and the parents of petitioner No. 2 are directed to be present in Court on

CRWP-12618-2024

the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 21.01.2025.

In the meanwhile, respondents No. 2 & 3 shall look into the threat perception and ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioners and shall file the status report on or before the next date of hearing.”

3. In compliance of the order passed by this Court, status report dated 10.01.2025 by way of an affidavit of Jogender Sharma, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kosli, District Rewari on behalf of respondent Nos.1 and 2-State has been filed, which is taken on record.
4. Learned State counsel submits that threat perception of the petitioners has been dispassionately assessed and the statements of the private respondents have been recorded, wherein, they have stated that they have never extended any threat to the petitioners and assured the concerned police officer that they will not interfere in the life and liberty of the petitioners as both of them are major.
5. In view of the above, no further directions are required to be issued and the present petition stands disposed of.

January 21, 2025
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |