



CRWP-5359-2026

148

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP-5359-2026
Date of decision: 06.05.2026

Neeraj and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: Mr. A.S. Gulati, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amish Sharma, AAG Haryana

SANJAY VASHISTH, J (ORAL)

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 Nos. 4 and 5.

PARTICULARS OF PETITIONERS:

Petitioner No.	Name & parantage	DOB or Age
1.	Neeraj, Son of Sh. Satpal	18 years
2.	Nazmeen, Daughter of Late Sh. Salim	19 years

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No. 1 is not of marriageable age and 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

**CRWP-5359-2026**

this Court by way of filing the instant petition. They have also submitted a representation dated 04.05.2026 (Annexure P-3), to respondent No. 2 – Commissioner of Police, District Panchkula, Haryana, wherein they have expressed their apprehension.

3. Notice of motion to the official respondents only.

4. On asking of the Court, learned State counsel accepts notice on behalf of the respondent – State. Let requisite copies of the complete paper book be supplied to learned State counsel during course of the day.

5. In view of the above, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No. 2. – Commissioner of Police, District Panchkula, Haryana, to look into the representation dated 04.05.2026 (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.

06.05.2026

reena

**(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes /No
2. Whether reportable : Yes /No