



**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**

S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 3314/2021

1. Smt. Maya Devi W/o Surajmal Verma, Aged About 33 Years, R/o Hospital Colony Village Daata, District Sikar, Rajasthan At Present R/o Sajay Bhatta Near Rainwal Jaipur Rajasthan
2. Banshi Lal S/o Madan Lal, Aged About 24 Years, R/o Shiv Singhpura Ward No. Kankra Sikar, Rajasthan

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State Of Rajasthan, Through Public Prosecutor
2. Superintendent of Police, Sikar, Collectorate Campus Sikar Rajasthan
3. SHO Police Station Daata Ramgarh, Sh And A Dataramgarh, Rajasthan
4. SHO P.S. Rainwal, Jaipur Road, Jaipur Rajasthan
5. Assistant Commissioner Of Police, Collectorate Campus, Banipark, Jaipur
6. Suraj Mal Balai S/o Ramu Lal Balai, Aged About 35 Years, Hospital Colony Village Daata District Sikar Rajasthan
7. Puran Mal Verma S/o Ramu Lal Balai, Aged About 38 Years, Hospital Colony, Village Datta District Sikar Rajasthan
8. Suresh Verma S/o Ramu Lal Balai, Aged About 30 Years, Hospital Colony Village Daata, District Sikar Rajasthan

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Krishan Chander Sharma
For Respondent(s) : Mr. C.G Chopra, PP

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SATISH KUMAR SHARMA

Order

13/08/2021

1. On noticing the fact that in order dated 10.08.2021, operative portion has been recorded totally inconsistent with the



WWW.LIVELAW.IN
finding of this Court, therefore, the matter has been listed today in
“to be mentioned” category.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners fairly submits for appropriate modification in the order.

3. In view of the legal finding of this Court in Para 7 of the order dated 10.08.2021, modified order is passed hereunder:-

4. This Petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for protection of life and personal liberty of the petitioners.

5. Heard learned counsel for both the sides and perused the material made available on record.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner is a married lady but she has been compelled to leave her matrimonial house. At present, she is living with petitioner No.2. The private respondents and others are not happy with their relation and they are threatening the petitioners. Given that their life and liberty is in danger, police protection may be granted to them.

7. Learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the petition.

8. In view of the order intended to be passed in the petition, being non-prejudicial to the private respondents, no notices are required against them.

9. Heard. Considered.

10. It is well settled legal position as expounded by the **Division Bench of Hon'ble Allahabad High Court in Smt. Aneeta & Anr. Vs. State of U.P. & Ors. (Writ C.No.14443/2021)** that live-in relationship cannot be at the cost of social fabric of this country, and directing the police to grant protection may indirectly give our assent to such illicit relations.




WWW.LIVELAW.IN

11. In view of the above legal position, the prayer for granting police protection is rejected, however, in case any offence is committed with the petitioners they are at liberty to lodge FIR in concerned police station or may take available legal recourse.

12. With the above observation the petition stands dismissed.

13. Earlier order dated 10.08.2021 be removed from the website.

14. If learned counsel for the petitioners or anybody else has procured certified copy of the earlier order, the same shall be deposited with the office and fresh certified copy of this order may be obtained.



(SATISH KUMAR SHARMA),J

FAHEEM AHMAD /147

