

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

CRWP-4082-2026

Date of decision : 09.04.2026

Rajwinder Kaur and another

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present :- Mr. Aman Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Barjinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India is for directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and personal liberty of the petitioners by providing adequate security/police protection to the petitioners. Further prayer has been made for directing respondents No.4 to 9 not to interfere in the personal life and liberty of the petitioners.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners states that both the petitioners are major and they are living in live-in-relationship against the wishes of private respondent and have sought protection to their life and liberty. He also submits that petitioner No.2 was earlier married to respondent No.4 and has child with her, and due to differences between them, petitioner No.2 is living separately from his wife. They apprehend danger from respondents No.4 to 9. The petitioners have submitted a representation dated 19.03.2026 (Annexure P-3) to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Police District Sangrur.



3. Notice of motion to respondents no.1 to 3-State only.
4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Raj Karan Singh, AAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State.
5. Without entering upon an exercise to evaluate the evidentiary value of the documents placed on the file, I dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Police District Sangrur to decide the representation dated 19.03.2026 (Annexure P-3) of the petitioners and grant them protection, if any threat to their life and liberty is perceived. It is clarified that this order shall not be taken to grant immunity to the petitioners from legal action for violation of law, if any, committed by them. This order would not be understood having expressed any opinion whatsoever by this Court on the validity of their live-in relationship.
6. Disposed of.

09.04.2026
m. sharma

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

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