

## “Relationship in nature of Marriage”

Sr. No.	Title	Citation	Question involved	Held
1	<b>Indra Sarma Vs VKV Sarma</b>	2014 (1) RCR (Crl) 179 (SC)	“Relationship in nature of Marriage”	Distinction drawn between ‘live in relationship’ and ‘relationship in nature of marriage’. - Promulgated some factors to look into for testing under what circumstances a live-in relationship will fall within the expression “relationship in the nature of marriage” under Section 2(f) of the DV Act. The guidelines, of course, are not exhaustive, but will definitely give some insight to such relationship. Women in live in relationship not covered under the definition and thus not entitle to any reliefs under the Act.
2	<b>D.Velusamy Vs D.Patchaiammal</b>	2010 (4) RCR (Crl) 746 (SC)	“Relationship in nature of Marriage”	Relationship in the nature of marriage defined and distinguished from live in relationship. Further held only women in relationship in nature of marriage entitled to reliefs under DV Act.
3	<b>Poonam Vs Vijay Kumar Jindal</b>	2015 (4) RCR (Crl) 300 (P&H)	“Relationship in nature of Marriage”	Same View taken as in Indra Sarma and Velusamy’s Case.
4	<b>Dimple Jatin Khanna @ Dimple ... Vs Anita Advani And Anr</b>	2016 (1) RCR (Crl) 530 (BOM)	“Relationship in nature of Marriage”	Where petitioner enters into relationship with a man who is already married which fact was in the knowledge of petitioner, cannot be held that the relationship was in the nature of marriage. Such petitioner not entitled to reliefs under DV Act.
5	<b>Deepak @ Gajanan</b>	2015 (3) RCR (Crl)	“Relationship in nature of Marriage”	A women marrying a person already married which was in her

	<b>Vs St. of Maharashtra</b>	1002 (BOM)		knowledge, such women not entitled to any relief under DV Act although two children were born to her. The said relationship cannot be termed as relationship in the nature of marriage. Children of such a marriage may be entitled relief u/s 25 CrP.C.
--	--------------------------------------	---------------	--	--