

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Crl. Misc. No. M-32991 of 2014

Date of decision: 10.02.2015

Minu and another

...Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: None for the petitioners.

Ms. Anmol Grewal, AAG, Punjab.

RITU BAHRI, J.

This petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C is for issuance of direction to respondent Nos. 1 to 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners and their family members and further to ensure that they may not be harassed by respondent No.4.

On notice, reply on behalf of respondent Nos. 1 to 4 in the shape of affidavit of Assistant Commissioner of Police (Central), Jalandhar, has been filed, wherein it has been stated that on the basis of statement made by Alok Kumar Jain-respondent No.5, FIR No.140 was registered on 10.09.2014, under Sections 363, 366-A IPC at Police Station Division No.2, Jalandhar. Subsequently, Section 120-B IPC was added on 11.09.2014. The complainant alleged that his daughter, Archita Jain, aged about 15 ½ years, was studying in Mahavir Jain Public School, Vijay Nagar, Jalandhar. On 08.09.2014, she had gone for tuition and returned back at 7.00 P.M. Thereafter, she went out at about 7.30 P.M., and since then, her whereabouts are not known. He alleged that Kartik Verma son of Rakesh Kumar Verma-

petitioner No.2 had kidnapped his daughter. After registration of the FIR, Archita Jain, daughter of the complainant, was recovered from Kartik Verma, son of the petitioners, from Maharashtra on 06.10.2014. Rakesh Kumar Verma-petitioner No.2 was arrested on 22.09.2014 and petitioner No.1 has been granted anticipatory bail. Archita Jain was handed over to her father on 09.10.2014. Son of the petitioners was arrested on 06.10.2014 from Maharashtra.

Learned State counsel, on instructions, has informed the Court that petitioner No.2 has already been released on regular bail and the anticipatory bail of petitioner No.1 has been confirmed by the Court. Challan in this case was presented on 03.12.2014.

In view of the reply filed by respondent Nos. 1 to 4, no further orders are required to be passed in this case.

Disposed of accordingly.

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

10.02.2015
ajp