



**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana  
at Chandigarh**

116

CRWP-2833-2026 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-18.03.2026

Sukhpreet Kaur and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBHAS MEHLA**

Present:- Ms. Varsha Chaudhary, Advocate for  
Ms. Anjali thakur, Advocate for the petitioners.

\*\*\*\*\*

**SUBHAS MEHLA, J.** (Oral)

1. Prayer in the instant petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondent Nos.1 to 3 to protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondent Nos.4 to 7 on account of the fact that the petitioners are involved in live-in-relationship with each other.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioner No.1-Sukhpreet Kaur is 18 years of age and petitioner No.2-Sawaran Singh is aged 23 years. It is submitted that except Aadhar Card, there is no authentic documents to prove the age of petitioner No.1-Sukhpreet Kaur. It is further submitted that the petitioners are involved in live-in-relationship, but they apprehend threat to their life and liberty from the private respondents. While drawing the attention of this Court to representation dated 07.03.2026 (Annexure P-3), learned counsel has submitted that the matter was reported to



CRWP-2833-2026 (O&M) ( 2 )

respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, District Sirsa, Haryana, seeking police protection, however, it went in vain. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioners would be satisfied if directions are issued to respondent No.2-Superintendent of Police, District Sirsa, Haryana, to look into the aforesaid representation and take appropriate steps at the earliest.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Mr. Karan Veer Singh, Sr. DAG, Haryana, who is present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent-State and submits that statement of family members of petitioner No.1 recorded wherein they stated that she is minor of 16 years of age. Learned State counsel further submitted that a child cannot have a live-in-relationship as it would be an act not only immoral but also illegal. There are several conditions for live-in-relation to be treated as relation in nature of marriage. In case, this is permitted, this would amount to putting premium on an illegal activity and thus, would not be in the interest of our society. Such kind of relationship should not be protected with the umbrella of protection granted by this Court. There is no dispute to the proposition that Article 21 of the Constitution of India is sacrosanct and it is imperative upon the State to take adequate measures to protect the life and liberty of each person. However, there are statutory safeguards required under the statutory schemes to protect the interest of a minor and once such a fact comes to the notice of the Court, it becomes incumbent upon the Court in its capacity as *parens patriae* to examine what is in the best interest of the minor.

5. Heard.



CRWP-2833-2026 (O&M) ( 3 )

6. In view of the contentions of learned State counsel, respondent No.2- Superintendent of Police, District Sirsa, Haryana, is directed that in case petitioner No.1 is found to be minor, then respondent No.2 is directed to follow the directions given by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in 'P..... Minor through Vikram vs. State of Haryana and others', CRWP-2139-2022 (O & M):

(i) *The petitioners are directed to appear before the SP/SSP concerned within a period of 07 days, from today, who after verifying the age of petitioner No.1 take action in accordance with law. If the girl is found minor then shall thereafter produce petitioner No.1 before the Child Welfare Committee constituted under the provisions of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015.*

(ii) *Respective committee shall conduct inquiry contemplated under Section 36 of Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 and pass an appropriate order by associating all the stakeholders to ensure that the objects of the Juvenile Justice Act are well served.*

(iii) *The Child Welfare Committee shall take appropriate decisions with respect to the boarding and lodging of the minor and also to conduct enquiry on all issues relating to and affecting safety and well-being of the child/minor.*

(iv) *During the pendency of such adjudication and passing of orders as contemplated under Section 37 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act 2015, the committee shall also take appropriate interim/decisions as regards placement of a child/custody of the child in need of care and protection.*

(v) *The concerned SSPs/SPs shall also take appropriate steps as warranted by law against the threat perception to the petitioners and to ensure that the petitioners are protected from any physical harm at the instance of the respondents in respective cases. **However, this will not create any impediment in taking action against petitioner No.2 as per law, if he is found to have committed any offence.***



CRWP-2833-2026 (O&amp;M)

( 4 )

(vi) *The petitioners are directed to appear in the office of SSP/SP of the respective Districts within a period of 07 days, failing which the concerned SSP/SP shall depute a Child Welfare Police Officer to produce the minor before the Child Welfare Committee within a period of 01 week thereafter.*

(vii) *The Child Welfare Committee constituted under the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act 2015, shall send a compliance report to this Court.*

7. Disposed of accordingly.

8. Registry is directed to send the copy of order along with petition and annexures to the concerned Superintendent of Police for necessary compliance.

**18.03.2026***Geeta***( SUBHAS MEHLA )  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No