



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

CRWP-2867-2026

Date of decision: 17.03.2026

NISAR AHMED AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

V/S

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA

Present: Mr. Imtiyaz Hussain, Advocate
 for the petitioners.

SUBHAS MEHLA, J. (ORAL)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Articles 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 and not to interfere in their lives.

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 09.03.2026 (Annexure P-3), learned counsel has submitted that the matter was reported to respondent No.2-The Superintendent of Police, District Nuh, Haryana seeking police protection, however, it went in vain. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioners would be satisfied if directions are issued to respondent No.2 to look into the aforesaid representation and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion.



4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Senior DAG, Haryana, accepted notice on behalf of the official respondents and submitted that the right to live-in relationship has taken the form of fundamental right, which has been concreted by the catena of decisions of Hon'ble Apex Court. But such kind of relationships, especially, in cases where the persons are already married and having children and are seeking to pursue a live-in relationship, affect the other family members, both mentally as well as financially. The irony is that the concept of fundamental right especially the right to life and liberty enshrined under Article 21 of the Constitution has been strengthened to such extent that such kind of impact cannot become bulwark against the said cherished right. He opposed the prayer made in the petition by submitting that in the present matter, petitioner No.1 is about 60 years old, having children and a wife, with whom the marriage still subsists, the protection if granted would become impediment in the maintenance of wife. Ergo, if such kind of relationships would be protected under the umbrella of order of protection, it would not only affect the matrimonial structure but shall also have a devastating impact upon the society.

5. Heard.

6. Right to live-in relationship has become an indispensable limb of fundamental right to life and liberty enshrined under Article 21 of Constitution of India. Petitioners before us are beseeching for their protection from the private respondents, as they are having apprehension of physical harm. 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, after assessing the threat perception, if any, to protect them from any physical harm.

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, nor any civil right vested in any person or family member shall be defeated by virtue of this order.

March 17, 2026
manisha

(SUBHAS MEHLA)
JUDGE

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