

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-41031 of 2015
Date of Decision:-22.12.2015**

Shalu Rani and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

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. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. R.S.Nain, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate for respondents No. 4 and 5.

HARI PAL VERMA J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for issuance of directions to respondents No.2 & 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents no.4 to 7

Learned counsel for the State has filed affidavit of Baljit Singh, S.I., S.H.O., Police Station Moonak, District-Sangrur i.e. respondent No.3, which is taken on record.

The SHO has verified the antecedents of the petitioners and as per his affidavit, one lady, namely, Lachhmi Devi was earlier married with Bittu Singh son of Boriya Singh from the last 15-16 years and three childrens were born from this marriage.

However, on 03.12.2012, Lachhmi Devi had taken divorce from Bittu Singh, vide order passed by learned Court of ASJ Sangrur. After divorce, she started living with petitioner No.2, namely, Nanak Singh son of Nahar Singh and without getting married, she developed physical relations with him.

The photocopies of ration card as well as passport reflecting Lachhmi Devi as wife of petitioner No.2- Nanak Singh have also been produced in Court, which are taken on record.

The said affidavit of SHO further suggests as under:

“Both petitioner No. 2 and said Lachhmi Devi were living as husband and wife on rent in the House of Babita Rani w/o Davinder Singh, House No.560, ward No.15, New Basti, Village Jakhhal, Police Station Jakhhal, District Fatehabad, Haryana.”

When these facts are confronted to the counsel for the petitioners, he wishes to withdraw the present petition.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

Admittedly, petitioner No.2 has concealed the aforesaid material facts in his petition, and, therefore, on account of concealment of these material facts, he is liable to be burdened with cost, which is quantified as Rs.10,000/-. This amount of cost be deposited with the Punjab State Legal Services Authority within one month from today. In case petitioner No.2 fail to deposit the said amount, counsel for the State is at liberty to bring this fact to the notice of this Court.

December 22, 2015
Anjal

[**HARI PAL VERMA**]
JUDGE