



CRWP-4617-2026(O&amp;M)

1

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

**CRWP-4617-2026(O&M)  
Date of Decision :22.04.2026**

Renu Bala and Another

....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and Others

....Respondents

**CORAM : HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANDEEP PANNU**

Present: Mr. Balwant Singh, Advocate for the petitioners

**MANDEEP PANNU J. (Oral)**

1. The present writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has been filed seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the official respondents to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners, who are two adult females living together, at the hands of private respondents, who are none other than their family members.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners seeks protection of life and liberty of the petitioners by contending that both of them are adult females and are living together in a 'live-in relationship' against the wishes of the private respondents and to seek appropriate protection from the authorities, they have submitted a representation dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure P-3) in this regard to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Khanna, District Ludhiana, but are still



apprehensive about their security in view of the apparent inaction and alleged clout of their family members-respondents.

3. Notice of motion only to official respondents.
4. On the asking of the Court, Mr. Sahil Chowdhary, AAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the official respondents. A copy of the paper-book be handed over to him during the course of the day.
5. Reliance in this regard can also be placed on judgment of the Supreme Court in **Devu G Nair vs. State of Kerala and others 2024 SCC Online 351**, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down various guidelines for the Courts in dealing with habeas corpus petitions or petitions for police protection by same sex friendship persons, so as to secure fundamental rights and dignity of intimate partners and members of the LGBTQ communities. The relevant guideline, pertaining to the facts of the present case, is reproduced as under:-

*“16(j). The Court must acknowledge that some intimate partners may face social stigma and a neutral stand of the land would be detrimental to the fundamental freedoms of the appellant. Therefore, a court while dealing with a petition for police protection by intimate partners on the grounds that they are a same sex, transgender, inter-faith or inter-caste couple must grant an ad-interim measure, such as immediately granting police protection to the petitioners, before establishing the threshold requirement of being at grave risk of violence and abuse. The protection granted to intimate partners must be with a view to maintain their privacy and dignity.”*



6. Similar view was taken by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CRWP-8041-2023** titled as **Pooja and another vs. State of Punjab and others, decided on 17.08.2023**, wherein life and liberty of two young adult females, who declare their fondness for each other and were living in a live-in relationship, has been protected by passing the following order:-

*“3. It remains undisputed that the petitioners are above 18 years of age; as such, they are adults and have all the legal rights to live as they desire, so long it does not violate any law. Their claim of fondness for each other and living together in a live-in relationship prima facie does not violate any provision of law in force. Love, attraction, and fondness have no boundaries, and not even the boundary of gender. However, some segments of societies cannot keep pace with the boldness of expression, courage not to be subservient, and the rapidly changing ethos and lifestyles that Gen-Z and millennials might like to embrace or follow, including openly proclaiming their attraction towards persons of similar gender. Article 21 of the Constitution of India does not cease to apply when people of the same gender decide to live together. Every person in the territory of India has an inherent and inalienable fundamental right to life flowing from Article 21 of India’s constitution, and the State is duty-bound to protect life.”*

7. Thus, in view of the law laid down in **Devu G Nair's** case and **Pooja’s** case (supra), this Court is of the view that the present petitioners are entitled to be granted protection of life and liberty.

**CRWP-4617-2026(O&M)****4**

8. Thus, the Senior Superintendent of Police, Khanna, District Ludhiana is directed to consider the representation dated 16.04.2026 (Annexure P-3) qua threat perception and take appropriate steps to ensure that no harm is caused to the life and liberty of the petitioners.

9. It is nevertheless clarified that this order is issued only on the premise that the petitioners are major as seen from the documents placed on record being their Aadhar Cards as Annexures P-1 and P-2 respectively. This would not *ipso facto* amount to granting any seal of approval on the legality of their relationship. Further, they would not be entitled for any protection against their arrest or continuance of any criminal proceedings, if otherwise, found to be involved in commission of any cognizable offence(s).

10. The petition is disposed of with the above direction.

11. Pending application(s), if any, is/are disposed of.

April 22, 2026  
rekha

**(MANDEEP PANNU)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/non-speaking : Yes/No  
Whether reportable : Yes/No