



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

120

CRWP-4747-2026 (O&M)
Decided on: 04.05.2026

PRACHI AND ANOTHERPetitioners
Versus
STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERSRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Aggarwal, Addl. AG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

1. By filing present petition, under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, petitioners seek necessary protection of their lives and personal liberty in view of the fact that **they are living in a live-in relationship** and are under eminent threats at the hands of respondent No.4.

PARTICULARS OF PETITIONERS:

Petitioner No.	Name & parantage	DoB or Age
1	Prachi	18 years
2.	Ranjeet	20 years

2. Noticing the aspect that both the petitioners are living in a live-in relationship, and petitioner No.1 is just 18 years of age and primarily a resident of Uttar Pradesh, on 23.04.2026, State was directed to verify the place of residence of both the petitioners, by recording as under:-

*“Petitioner No. 1 – Prachi, aged 18 years is resident of U.P.
Let credentials of the petitioners be verified by the State of Haryana and since when and where both of them are residing and also to verify, how petitioner No. 1 came in contact with petitioner No. 2 - Ranjeet.
Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be supplied to learned State counsel within two days.
List again on 04.05.2026.”*

**CRWP-4747-2026 (O&M)****2**

3. Today, learned State counsel has filed status report dated 02.05.2026, in the Court today and the same is taken on record. Registry is directed to tag the same at the appropriate place on the file.

4. Learned State counsel submits that, as per the inquiry conducted, both the petitioners were working together in Noida. It is further informed that they are presently residing in a live-in relationship at the address of petitioner No.2-Ranjeet, in District Nuh (Haryana).

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that although, both the petitioners are major, but petitioner No.2, being not of marriageable age, are living in a live-in relationship against the wishes of their family members, who are threatening and interfering in the life of the petitioners. Hence, the petitioners are seeking protection in that regard and have approached this Court by way of filing the instant petition. They have also submitted a representation dated 22.04.2026 (Annexure P-3), to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Mewat (wrongly mentioned as Senior Superintendent of Police, Mewat in the memo of parties as well as in the representation), wherein, they have expressed their apprehension.

6. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 – Superintendent of Police, Mewat (wrongly mentioned as Senior Superintendent of Police, Mewat in the memo of parties as well as in the representation), to look into the representation dated 22.04.2026 (Annexure P-3), *qua* threat perception, and if there is any substance in it, take necessary steps, in accordance with law, to ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners are not jeopardized at the hands of the private respondents.

6. However, this direction will not validate the live-in status between the petitioners and will have no effect on any civil or criminal action, which could be initiated in the matter in accordance with law.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

04.05.2026

Lavisha

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**
Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**