



CRWP-12972-2025

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

145

CRWP-12972-2025
Decided on: 02.12.2025

Annu and another
Versus
State of Punjab and others
.....Petitioners
.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. Balwant Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vinay Malhotra, DAG, Punjab.
(appeared on advance notice).

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By filing present petition, under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberty in view of the fact that **they are living in a live-in relationship** and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondents No.4 to 12.

PARTICULARS OF PETITIONERS:

Petitioner No.	Name & parentage	DoB or Age
1.	Annu d/o Ramesh Kumar	18 years
2.	Vishal s/o Satyawar	19 years

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that although both the petitioners are major, but petitioner No.2 is not of marriageable age. The petitioners are living in a live-in relationship against the wishes of their family members, who are allegedly threatening them and interfering in their personal lives. Hence, the petitioners are seeking protection in that regard and have approached this Court by way of filing the instant petition. They have also submitted a representation dated

**CRWP-12972-2025**

2

27.11.2025 (Annexure P-3), wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

4. On asking of the Court, learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent – State. Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be supplied to learned State counsel during course of the day.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2- The Senior Superintendent of Police, Patiala to look into the representation dated 27.11.2025 (Annexure P-3), *qua* threat perception, and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents.

6. However, this direction will not validate the live-in status between the petitioners and will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

02.12.2025

rashmi

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**