



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

108

CRWP-10341-2026

Date of Decision: 08.09.2026

RASID AND ANR

....Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

....Respondents(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present : Mr. Imtiyaz Hussain, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Swati Batra, Sr. DAG, Haryana.
(along with S.I.-Azruddin)

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Article 226 of Constitution of India seeking issuance of directions to the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of private respondents.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that both the petitioners are major and in a live-in-relationship and have threat to their life and liberty as they are in said relationship against the wishes of private respondents. It is submitted that on account of threat perception they are unable to go back to their home and they are under constant fear and danger. Learned counsel submits that the petitioners has submitted representation on 13.08.2026 to the Authorities and thereafter they approached this Court.

3. Learned State counsel submits that on the representation filed by the petitioners, statement of respondent no.4 (husband of petitioner no.2), respondents no. 9, 10, 11 & 12 who are co-villagers have been recorded and



there is no threat perception. However, this petition raises serious questions as petitioner no.1 is already married to respondent no.13 and has two children from the said wedlock. Further, petitioner no.2 is also married to respondent no.4 and has 06 children from the said wedlock. The Courts cannot lose sight of the fact with regard to the future of these 08 children who are going to face the society for the years to come for the act and conduct of the petitioners.

4. Strangely in the recent times, it has been found that concept of live-in-relationship is being misused and abused; however that question is kept open but the fundamental pre-requisite for seeking protection of life and liberty is that there has to be some cogent specific threat apprehensions to the life and liberty of the petitioners. In the present case, the petitioners have failed to establish any such apprehension. The petition appears to be an attempt to cover up the promiscuous relationship of the petitioners under the guise of legal process, thereby amounting to an abuse of the process of law.

5. There is no denial of the fact that every citizen is entitled to personal life and liberty and the State is duty bound to protect life and liberty of the citizens but this right cannot be invoked to permit the citizens to undermine the rule of law. The life and liberty of the petitioners have to be weighed equally with the rights of dignified life of the other immediate family members, particularly their lawful spouses and their respective children. Apart from vague and bald assertions, neither the petition nor the representation submitted to respondent no.2 demonstrates any material substance regarding the alleged threat.

6. Though it is a fit case where the directions need to be issued to deposit certain sum in the form of FDR in the name of each child but considering the request of the counsel for the petitioners, no such direction is issued.

7. In light of the above and considering the fact that if such protection as claimed is granted, it would disrupt the entire social fabric of society. Accordingly, finding no merits in the present petition, the same is **dismissed**.

8. Needless to say that State is duty bound to protect the life and liberty of its citizens.

08.09.2026
Deepak Patwal

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|----|----------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. | <i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| 2. | <i>Whether reportable</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |