



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

119

CRWP-8236-2025

Date of decision: 31.07.2025

SAGAR AND ANOTHER

....PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF UT CHANDIGARH AND OTHERS

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUMEET GOEL, J.**

1. The petitioners have approached this Court for issuance of necessary directions for protecting their life and liberties which according to them are at stake because they are in a live-in-relationship. The petitioners claim themselves to be major in terms of age. According to the copies of the Aadhar Cards (Annexure P-1 and P-2), the date of birth of the petitioner No.1-Sagar is 16.11.2005 and the date of birth of the petitioner No.2-Dolly is 08.04.2006.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that a marriage is not a must for providing security to a couple in a 'live-in-relationship' because protection qua life and liberty is sacrosanct and stands at the highest pedestal. He has also placed reliance upon orders passed by the co-ordinate Bench of this Court in '*Sarabjeet Kaur and another versus State of Punjab and others*' in CRWP-102-2022 decided on 07.01.2022; '*Goutam Kumar and another versus State of Punjab and others*' in CRWP-8088-2021



decided on 26.08.2021; *Bharti and Another Versus State of U.T., Chandigarh & others* and '*Annu Rani & Anr. vs. State of Haryana*' in CRWP-11060-2023 decided on 15.11.2023.

3. Notice of motion to respondent Nos. 1 to 3 (i.e. official respondents).

4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sandeep Vashisht, Additional Public Prosecutor, UT, Chandigarh, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents.

5. At this stage, without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case as well as on the age and nature of the relationship between the petitioners; I deem it appropriate to direct respondent No. 2 (Senior Superintendent of Police, Chandigarh) to look into the matter and pass an appropriate order on the representation stated to have been filed by the petitioners before him/her on 28.07.2025 (Annexure P-3) & pass appropriate orders thereupon within two weeks from today.

6. However, if the petitioners are found to have been involved in any other case, then this order shall not preclude the competent authority from taking lawful action against the petitioners.

7. The petition stands disposed off. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)  
JUDGE

July 31, 2025  
*jatin*

Whether speaking/reasoned:  
Whether reportable:

Yes/No  
Yes/No