

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-11465 of 2015

Date of decision: November 17, 2015

**Mandeep Kamboj**

-----Petitioner (s)

V/s

**State of Haryana & others**

-----Respondent(s)

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA**

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. Vikas Lochab, Advocate for  
Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate the petitioner(s).

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

---

**HARI PAL VERMA, J.**

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No.83, dated 21.03.2015 (Annexure P-1), under Section 363 and 366 IPC, registered at Police Station, Madhuban, Karnal and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner, namely, Mandeep Kamboj and respondent No.4, namely, Seema Rani have got married and they are staying together peacefully as husband and wife. He further submits that respondent No.4-Seema Rani, who is wife of the petitioner-Mandeep Kamboj, is pregnant from the petitioner. He also prayed that since they are living together happily as husband and wife, therefore, FIR-in-question is liable to be quashed.

Learned counsel for the State has filed reply by way of affidavit of Rajesh Kumar, HPS, Dy. Superintendent of Police, (HQ), Karnal, on behalf of

respondents No. 1 and 2 in Court today. The same is taken on record.

As per the reply, the investigation was carried out by the police and during course of investigation, the police has recorded the statement under Section 161 Cr.P.C. of Rattan Lal, Raj Bala, Kanwal Lal, Sahil and other prosecution witnesses. Moreover, even the statement of respondent No.4-Seema Rani has also been recorded under Section 164 Cr.P.C., wherein, she stated that she solemnized marriage with Mandeep Kumar (present petitioner) with her own free will and staying with him in village Daha. She has also shown her inclination not to proceed further with the case in any manner.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from SI-Bir Singh, also submits that after conducting the investigation, the police has prepared the cancellation and the same is being filed before the learned Magistrate.

In view of reply, filed on behalf of respondents No. 1 and 2, as well as the statement made by learned counsel for the State, the present petition has been rendered infructuous and the same is disposed of as such.

It is, however, made clear that in case the cancellation report as prepared by police has not been accepted by the learned Magistrate, the petitioner will be at liberty to revive the present petition.

**November 17, 2015**

***Anjal***

**( HARI PAL VERMA )**

***JUDGE***