



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

117

**CRWP-4468-2026 (O&M).
Date of Decision: 26.05.2026.**

Paiham and another

....Petitioners.

VERSUS

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

--

Present: Mr. Shivam Vashisth, Advocate for the petitioners.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. By way of filing this petition, petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberty in view of the fact that they have not solemnized their marriage so far and are living in a live-in relationship, as petitioner No.1-Paiham is though major but not of marriageable age, and are under eminent threat at the hands of respondents No.4 to 11.

2. On 18.05.2026, following was recorded:-

i) *Learned State counsel has produced the School Leaving Certificate of petitioner No.1-Paiham and submits that her date of birth is recorded as 02.04.2008. He further informs that DDR No. 94 dated 11.04.2026 has already been registered regarding the missing of petitioner No.1 at Police Station Ganj, District Rampur, Uttar Pradesh.*

(ii) *Let the aforesaid facts be verified by the respondent-State, particularly as to whether there are any allegations against the petitioner(s).*

Respondent-State is further directed to ascertain whether petitioner No.1, who attained the age of majority on 02.04.2026, is residing with

petitioner No.2 of her own free will and consent or under any compulsion or coercive circumstances.

iii) List on 26.05.2026.”

3. Short reply dated 25.05.2026 has been filed by learned State counsel, in Court today, which is taken on record. Registry to tag the same at an appropriate place. In Paragraph 2, 3 and 5 of the reply, it has been explained that on verification, it is found that except of a missing report at Police Station Ganj, District Rampur (U.P.), vide DDR No.94 dated 11.04.2026, no criminal case is found registered and antecedents of both the petitioners are clean. Statement of petitioner No.1-Paiham has also been recorded, according to which, she herself came from her native village firstly to Delhi and then travelled to Phagwara and with her own free will, is now staying with petitioner No.2.

4. Since, petitioners have not contracted any marriage and seek only protection qua their lives and personal liberty, and for the same already representation dated 17.04.2026 (Annexure P-3) is pending, it would be appropriate to direct respondent No.2 to have a fair look to the said representation, on the grievance of the petitioners in order to ascertain veracity of allegations made by them.

5. Respondent No.2 would be at liberty to devise his/her own mechanism to ascertain the truth. He/she would also be at liberty to join the petitioners or any other person acquainted with facts in issue. If the innocence of the petitioners is established, then respondent No.2 shall proceed to take appropriate action in order to protect lives and personal liberty of the petitioners from being invaded by private respondents No.4 to 11.

6. The aforesaid order is being passed at this stage without meaning anything on the status of the parties on the basis of live-in relationship and age of petitioners. Respondent No.2 would consider and pass necessary order without being influenced by any statement of fact recorded herein-above.

Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

26.05.2026

jitender

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/ No