



2026:AHC:126412

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - C No. - 23457 of 2026

Maijveen And Another

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 3 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Shivesh Mishra
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 38

HON'BLE PRAKASH PADIA, J.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the record.

Facts in brief is that the date of birth of petitioner no. 1 namely Aradhya Chauhan is 5.4.2004, copy of the School Leaving Certificate is appended as annexure-1 to the writ petition. According to the Adhar Card, which is appended along-with writ petition as annexure-2 the date of birth of the petitioner no. 2 is 1.3.2002. It is stated in paragraph-7 of the writ petition that both the petitioners are living in live-in relationship. It is further stated that both the petitioners are living peacefully but wholly illegally respondent no.4 along-with family members are harassing them.

The petitioners claim that they are adults and living together out of their own freewill. It is stated that for the said reason, the respondent no.4 and the family members have got annoyed and there is serious danger to the lives of the petitioners as they are being threatened and harassed.

The petitioners have averred in the writ petition that they are living in live-in-relationship. It is stated that they have apprehension that private respondent can eliminate them for the honour of their family. In case this Court does not grant them protection, their lives may be endangered.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the record.

In view of the order proposed to be passed, there is no need to issue notice to private respondent.

The Supreme Court in a long line of decisions has settled the law that

where a boy and a girl are major and they are living with their free will, then, nobody including their parents, has authority to interfere with their living together. Reference may be made to the judgements of the Supreme Court in the cases of ***Gian Devi v. The Superintendent, Nari Niketan, Delhi and others, (1976) 3 SCC 234; Lata Singh v. State of U.P. and another, (2006) 5 SCC 475; and, Bhagwan Dass v. State (NCT of Delhi), (2011) 6 SCC 396***, which have consistently been followed by the Supreme Court and this Court, as well as of this Court in ***Deepika and another v. State of U.P. and others, 2013 (9) ADJ 534***. The Supreme Court in *Gian Devi* (supra) has held as under:

"7. ... Whatever may be the date of birth of the petitioner, the fact remains that she is at present more than 18 years of age.

As the petitioner is sui juris no fetters can be placed upon her choice of the person with whom she is to stay, nor can any restriction be imposed regarding the place where she should stay. The court or the relatives of the petitioner can also not substitute their opinion or preference for that of the petitioner in such a matter."

Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the petitioners are at liberty to live together and no person shall be permitted to interfere in their peaceful living. In case any disturbance is caused in the peaceful living of the petitioners, the petitioners shall approach the **Senior Superintendent of Police, Bareilly** alongwith certified copy of this order. The concerned Authority/Official shall provide immediate protection to the petitioners.

A liberty is granted to the private respondent that if the documents brought on the record are fabricated or forged, it will be open to him to file a recall application for recall of this order.

The petitioners undertake to get their marriage registered within a period of three months.

If the petitioners could not get their marriage registered within the stipulated period herein above, the protection granted under this order shall stand automatically vacated.

It is made clear that this Court has not adjudicated upon the alleged

marriage of the petitioners and this order in no way expresses opinion about the validity of their marriage.

With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition is partly **allowed**.

No order as to costs.

(Prakash Padia,J.)

June 9, 2026
KJ