



CRWP-4760-2026

1

132

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-4760-2026

Date of Decision: 24.04.2026

UNJEELA AND ANOTHER

...PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present: Mr. Khalid Tauru, Advocate for the petitioners.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus for direction to respondents No. 1 to 3 for protection of life and liberty of the petitioners as they are staying in live in relationship as per their will and do not interfere in the peaceful life of the petitioners at the behest of private respondent No. 4 and 5.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 has been in a *live in* relationship with petitioner No.2. The private respondents have has been extending threats of dire consequences to the petitioners as they are averse to their *live in* relationship. While drawing the attention of this Court to Annexure P-3 dated 15.04.2026, learned counsel has submitted that the matter was reported to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Palwal seeking police help but in vain. Learned counsel submits that the petitioners would be satisfied if directions are



CRWP-4760-2026

2

issued to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Palwal to look into the aforesaid representation and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion to respondents No.1 to 3 only.
4. At the asking of the Court, Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, AAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondents No. 1 to 3.
5. In view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioners and without commenting upon the status of *live in* relationship of the petitioners, the present petition is disposed of with directions to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, Palwal to look into the aforesaid representation qua the alleged threat perception and take necessary steps, as may be required, in accordance with law, to ensure that the life and liberty of the petitioners is not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondent. However, this direction will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.
6. It is made clear that there is no adjudication on merits and this is not a blanket order of protection from arrest in any FIR. It is further made clear that this order shall not come in the way if the interrogation of the petitioners is required in any cognizable case.

24.04.2026
janki

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned :
Whether Reportable :

Yes/No
Yes/No