



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

178

CRWP-3932-2026

Date of decision: 06.04.2026

Salma and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Anoop K. Yadav, Advocate, for the petitioners.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents as they are in a 'live-in' against the wishes of their family members.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners refers to the averments made in the petition, to state that both the petitioners are major and their age are 19 and 44 years old respectively. Copy of School Leaving Certificate of petitioner No.1 is appended as Annexure P-2. The petitioners are stated to be in a 'live-in relationship', on account of which family members of petitioner No.1 are giving threats to them.

3. Notice of motion.

4. At the asking of the Court, Mr. BS Saroha, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and has no objection in deciding the representation filed on behalf of the petitioners.

5. In CRWP-4521-2021 titled as **Pardeep Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and others** decided on 18.05.2021 and in LPA 1678-2014 titled as **Rajwinder Kaur and another vs. State of Punjab and others** decided on 09.10.2014, wherein considering the fundamental rights ensured under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, it was observed that marriage is not a must for providing protection to a couple in a "Live-in Relationship" and that while they might be required to satisfy an appropriate forum regarding the validity of their marriage but even in the absence of the same, the State is obligated to protect their life and liberty.

6. Resultantly, in light of the above, this Court is of the view that even in the case at hand, the protection qua the life and liberty of the petitioners being sacrosanct stands at the highest pedestal and as such, without commenting upon the aspect of the nature of their relationship or expressing any opinion on merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Nuh, to look into the representation dated 02.04.2026 (Annexure P-1) and if any threat perception is found, to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

7. It is however, made clear that this order shall not preclude the authorities to proceed against the petitioners, in case, they are found involved in any other criminal proceedings, instituted/pending against them if there is some evidence that surfaces regarding their involvement in a cognizable offence, for which they may be required by the investigating agency.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

06.04.2026

ashok

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No