

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN AT
JODHPUR**

S.B. Criminal Writ Petition No. 600/2026

1. Lakshita Shakdipliy D/o Pramod Shakdipliy, Aged About 21 Years, R/o Sevko Ka Mohalla Amet Charbhuj Road District Rajsamand At Present R/o Near Sur Bai Temple Amet District Rajsamand
2. Narayan Singh S/o Dal Singh, Aged About 28 Years, R/o Near Sur Bai Temple Amet District Rajsamand

----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Secretary Department Of Home Government Of Rajasthan Jaipur
2. The Superintendent Of Police, Rajsamand
3. The Sho, Police Station Amet District Rajsamand
4. Pramod Shakdipliy S/o Shanti Lal Sharma, R/o Sevko Ka Mohalla Amet Charbhuj Road District Rajsamand
5. Hitendra Sharma S/o Shanti Lal Sharma, R/o Sevko Ka Mohalla Amet Charbhuj Road District Rajsamand
6. Vinod Sharma S/o Shanti Lal Sharma, R/o Sevko Ka Mohalla Amet Charbhuj Road District Rajsamand
7. Lokesh Sharma S/o Shanti Lal Sharma, R/o Sevko Ka Mohalla Amet Charbhuj Road District Rajsamand
8. Rohit Sharma S/o Vishnu Lal Sharma, R/o Gugsa Ki Gali Loyo Ka Chowk District Nagaur

----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. Kamal Kishore
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Shriram Choudhary, AGA Mr. Abhay Bhojak

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FARJAND ALI

Order

11/02/2026

1. The present Criminal Writ Petition has been preferred by the petitioners under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of appropriate directions to the official respondents for providing them protection, on the ground that they apprehend threat to their life and personal liberty at the hands of the private respondents.
2. In the circumstances, the writ petition is being considered and decided on the basis of the averments, grounds and material placed on record.
3. As per the pleadings, the petitioners claim to be majors and of marriageable age and assert that they have executed an agreement for live in relationship dated 10.12.2025. It is further stated that they are residing together as per their own free will and wish and that the private respondents are opposed to the said relationship and are allegedly extending threats, giving rise to an apprehension to the life and personal liberty of the petitioners.
4. Learned counsel for the private respondent opposes the prayer for protection.
5. The petitioners are currently living together; however, this Court is neither recognizing their live-in relationship status nor commenting on the validity of it. The petitioners have apprehended that they may be subjected to bodily harm by the private respondents. Being the sentinel of the Constitution, while entertaining this writ petition, this Court is obligated to issue appropriate directions to public

authorities to ensure that no person takes the law into their own hands.

6. In view of the above, the writ petition is disposed of. It is expected of the concerned Superintendent of Police that they interact with Petitioner No. 1, ensuring that she is in isolation from Petitioner No. 2, so as to ascertain that she is neither under duress, coercion, compulsion, nor threat. Thereafter, the Superintendent shall issue necessary directions to subordinate officers to ensure that no harm is caused to the petitioners by anyone taking the law into their own hands.
7. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(FARJAND ALI),J