



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

185

CRWP-3393-2026 (O & M)

Date of decision: 24.03.2026

TEJPREET SINGH AND ANOTHER

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

Present : Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of direction to the official respondents to protect life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents as they are in a 'live-in' against the wishes of their family members.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners refers to the averments made in the petition, to state that both the petitioners are major and the date of birth of petitioner No.1 and No.2 are 28.12.2006 and 01.02.2005, respectively. Copies of their Aadhar cards are appended as Annexures P-1 and P-2, respectively. The petitioners are stated to be in a 'live-in relationship', on account of which family members of petitioner No.2 are giving threats to them.

3. Notice of motion.

4. At the asking of the Court, Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and has no objection in deciding the representation filed on behalf of the petitioners.

5. In CRWP-4521-2021 titled as **Pardeep Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and others** decided on 18.05.2021 and in LPA 1678-2014 titled as **Rajwinder Kaur and another vs. State of Punjab and others** decided on 09.10.2014, wherein considering the fundamental



rights ensured under Article 21 of the Constitution of India, it was observed that marriage is not a must for providing protection to a couple in a “Live-in Relationship” and that while they might be required to satisfy an appropriate forum regarding the validity of their marriage but even in the absence of the same, the State is obligated to protect their life and liberty.

6. Resultantly, in light of the above, this Court is of the view that even in the case at hand, the protection qua the life and liberty of the petitioners being sacrosanct stands at the highest pedestal and as such, without commenting upon the aspect of the nature of their relationship or expressing any opinion on merits of the case, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Tarn Taran, to look into the representation dated 23.03.2026, Annexure P-3, and if any threat perception is found, to take appropriate action in accordance with law.

7. It is however, made clear that this order shall not preclude the authorities to proceed against the petitioners, in case, they are found involved in any other criminal proceedings, instituted/pending against them if there is some evidence that surfaces regarding their involvement in a cognizable offence, for which they may be required by the investigating agency.

24.03.2026

parveen kumar

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No