

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.09 18:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM No. M-641 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 8.1.2015

Harpreet Kaur and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Petitioners in person with Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate.

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners, who are stated to be major, claim that they have married against the wishes of their parents on 21.12.2014. The photographs of the marriage have been placed on file as Annexure-P-4. The copy of Secondary School Examination certificate, showing the date of birth of petitioner No. 1 and copy of the Aadhar Card, showing the date of birth of petitioner No. 2 have been placed on file as Annexures-P-1 and P-2. The marriage certificate has been placed on record as Annexure-P-3.

It is claimed that the petitioners have moved an application undated (Annexure-P-5) before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ropar, for protecting their life and liberty as they apprehend danger to their life from the private respondents.

In these circumstances, petition is disposed of with a direction to the Senior Superintendent of Police, Ropar, to consider the application of the petitioners undated (Annexure-P-5) and assess the threat perception to the life and liberty of the petitioners and if it is found that there is danger to the life of the petitioners, necessary steps be taken to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners.

However, it is made clear that this order shall not be taken to be the proof of valid marriage.

Disposed of accordingly.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.09 18:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM No. M-42380 of 2014 (O/M)
Date of decision : 8.1.2015

Lokesh and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Surinder Dagar, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, Assistant Advocate General,
Haryana.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioners, after arguing for some time, seeks to withdraw the present petition, at this stage.

Dismissed as withdrawn, at this stage.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.09 18:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM No. M-38401 of 2014 (O/M)
Date of decision : 8.1.2015

Gobind Singh and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Harsh Aggarwal, Advocate, for the petitioners.

Mr. Nikhil K. Chopra, Deputy A.G. Punjab.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

-.-

-.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Hardeep Singh states that petitioners No. 1 and 3 have been thoroughly interrogated and are not required for further interrogation. Therefore, the interim bail granted by this Court qua petitioners No. 1 and 3 on 12.11.2014, is made absolute.

Petition is accordingly allowed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

Kala Singh alias Hardip Singh Versus State of Punjab

Present:- Mr. S.P.S. Sidhu, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Nikhil K. Chopra, Deputy A.G. Punjab.

-. -

-. -

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the occurrence was in two parts. The present petitioner Kala Singh @ Hardip Singh is stated to have taken part in the first occurrence. The murder was committed by Varinderjit Singh in the second occurrence. It is pleaded that there was no common intention. It is further pleaded that there was no injury on the person of Jagjit Singh, to whom the petitioner is stated to have caused injuries in the first occurrence.

The copies of the statements of the doctors, who have been examined before the trial Court, be produced within one week.

List on 16.1.2015.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

Joginder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and others

Present:- None.

:-

:-

Despite second call, none is present on behalf of the
petitioners.

In the interest of justice, adjourned to 5.2.2015.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

CRM No. 335 of 2015 in/and
CRM No. M-43910 of 2014 (O/M)

Vikram and others Versus State of Haryana

Present:- Mr. N.S. Sekhawat, Advocate,
for the applicants-petitioners.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, Assistant A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Arvind Singh, Advocate, for the complainant.

-.-

-.-

CRM No. 335 of 2015

Prayer in this application is for placing on record
Annexure-P-10 (Tatima Challan) and exemption from filing certified
copy thereof.

Annexure-P-10 (Tatima Challan) is taken on record and
exemption is granted from filing certified copy thereof.

Copy of the application alongwith the copy of annexures
be supplied to the learned counsel for the complainant.

Application is disposed of accordingly.

CRMNo. M-43910 of 2014

Learned counsel for the complainant also wants to
produce some documents.

May do so within two weeks.

List on 30.1.2015.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.09 18:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

Gurchet Singh @ Seti Versus State of Punjab

Present:- Mr. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, Deputy A.G. Punjab.

-.-

-.-

It comes out that the original period of 180 days was to expire on 8.12.2014. An application was filed for extension of time on 6.12.2014, which was allowed and vide order dated 15.12.2014 (Annexure-P-2), the time for presenting the challan was extended till 8.1.2015.

The learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Sandhura Singh, has informed the Court that another application for extension of time was moved, which was dismissed by the trial Court. The challan has not been presented so far. Since the extended period is to expire today, list on 9.1.2015.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

CRM No.28992 of 2014 in/and
CRA No.S-3851-SB of 2014 (O/M)

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.09 18:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

Gurmeet Singh Versus State of Punjab and others

Present:- Mr. Arvind Thakur, Advocate,
for the applicant-appellant.

-.-

-.-

Learned counsel for the applicant-appellant contends that the deceased son of the complainant/appellant was only 25 years of age and he committed suicide within six months of the marriage leaving behind a suicide note, in which all the accused were named.

Notice of the application for condonation of delay for 26.2.2015.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

CRM No. 2708 of 2014 in/and
CRM No. A-127-MA of 2014 (O/M)

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.09 18:00
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

Smt. Ratni Versus Hanuman Singh and others

Present:- Mr. Vinod Yadav, Advocate, for,
 Mr. Narender Yadav, Advocate,
 for the applicant-appellant.

-.-

-.-

Learned proxy counsel states that the arguing counsel is
down with fever.

It comes out that it was a complaint case. The present
appeal is against the acquittal. There is also an application for
condonation of delay of 1065 days in filing the present appeal.

List on 19.2.2015 for arguments.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks

Harjeet Singh Versus State of Punjab and others

Present:- Mr. K.S. Lakhanpal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashish Sanghi, Deputy A.G. Punjab.

Mr. Amandeep Sibia, Advocate, for the complainant.

-.-

-.-

State has put in appearance. Reply not filed.

In this case, the challan is also stated to have been presented in the Court of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Faridkot. In these circumstances, the parties are directed to put in appearance before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Faridkot. The learned CJM, Faridkot, shall record the statements of the parties and report back to this Court whether the parties have entered into a compromise and if so, whether the same is genuine and without any pressure and also whether the same is for the benefit of the minor.

Report of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Faridkot, be awaited for 26.2.2015.

In the meanwhile, the State may also submit the reply.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

8.1.2015
sjks