



1

WP-19028-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE

BEFORE

HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR GUPTA

ON THE 3rd OF JUNE, 2026WRIT PETITION No. 19028 of 2026*RIDHAM VERMA AND OTHERS**Versus**THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH AND OTHERS*

.....
Appearance:

Shri Rakesh Kumar Sharma - Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Anshul Rajpurohit - G.A. for respondent Nos.1 to 3/State.

.....

ORDER

1. This petition has been preferred by the petitioners, who are 20 and 26 years of age respectively seeking the following relief:-

“(1) That the respondents’ No.2 and 3 may kindly be directed to give proper protection and help against the respondent No.4 and his associates.

(2) That the respondent No.2 and 3 be directed to punish respondent No.4 in accordance with law.

(3) That the petitioners be given full protection and security and false case should not be registered against the petitioner No.2.

(4) Pass any other appropriate order as may be deemed fit just & expedient in the interest of justice.”

2. The grievance of the petitioners are that they are residing together against the wishes of their parents, but are apprehending that some untoward action may be taken by the parents of petitioner no.1, thus, protection in this regard has been sought.

3. In support of his contention that protection can be granted to live



in partner also, counsel for the petitioners has drawn attention of this Court to a decision rendered by the case of Nandakumar v. State of Kerala reported as (2018) 16 SCC 602, in which in a habeas corpus petition, the Supreme Court has taken note of the relationship between the persons involved, and opined that since both the persons were major, and even if they are not competent to enter into wedlock, they have a right to live together and even outside the wedlock. Thus, it is submitted that the present petitioners, who are entitled to reside together may be protected from any violence by any person or their parents.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent/State, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer and submitted that the petitioner no.1 girl is only 20 years old, and has not even completed 21 years which is marriageable age, and thus, it is submitted that no case for interference is made out. It is also submitted that if such protection is granted, it would not be in the larger interest of the society, and would promote promiscuousness in the society.

5. Heard. Having considered the rival submissions, and on perusal of the documents filed on record, as also the aforesaid decision of the Hon'ble Supreme court, in para 10 of which it has been observed as under:-

“10.We need not go into this aspect in detail. For our purposes, it is sufficient to note that both Appellant 1 and Thushara are major. Even if they were not competent to enter into wedlock (which position itself is disputed), they have right to live together even outside wedlock. It would not be out of place to mention that “live-in relationship” is now recognized by the legislature itself which has found its place under the provisions of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005.”

6. In view of the aforesaid, this Court is inclined to allow the present petition as despite the fact that petitioner No.1 is 20 years old only, and has not even completed 21 years, since she is a major, she is entitled to reside as



per her own will, and if she so decides, her choice needs to be protected from external forces.

7. With the aforesaid observations, the petition stands allowed, and respondents are directed to provide such protection to the petitioners as required. Counsel for the petitioners is also directed to apprise the petitioners about the concerns expressed by this court.

8. It is directed that a copy of this order be supplied to the office of the Advocate General so that this order may be communicated to the respondent No.2/DCP, Zone – 1, Indore for prompt compliance of the order.

9. The concerned SHO, Police Station Indore, District Indore/respondent no.3 is also directed to share his/her mobile number with the petitioners so that they can reach him/her at any time, in case of any emergency.

10. With the aforesaid direction, the petition stands disposed off.

(RAJESH KUMAR GUPTA)
V. JUDGE