

233

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

**CRWP No.1956 of 2014
Date of Decision: 10.03.2015**

RANDHIR SINGH

.....Petitioner

Vs

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr. Nonish Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajesh K. Sheoran, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. R.K. Saini, Advocate
for respondent No.5.

Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate
for respondent No.6.

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

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J.

Prayer in the criminal writ petition is for the issuance of writ in the nature of habeas corpus directing the respondents No.2 and 3 to get release the detainee namely Suman Bala from illegal custody of respondents No.5 and 6.

In pursuance of notice issued on 30.12.2014 and 09.01.2015 by this Court Mr. R. K. Saini, Advocate and Mr. Naresh Kaushik, Advocate have put in appearance on behalf respondents No.5 and 6 respectively.

Learned State counsel has filed reply on verification of

facts. As per reply filed by the State, Suman Bala was earlier married to one Ram Dass and the said marriage was dissolved by decree of divorce on 17.10.2014. In divorce proceedings the defence of the husband was struck off vide order dated 30.05.2014 and thereafter respondent No.5 married Suman Bala on 02.06.2014. The decision passed by the matrimonial court was assailed in appeal by first husband in **FAO No.10089 of 2014** which was dismissed on 05.02.2015.

Today Suman Bala has also come present in the Court and stated that she is living with respondent No.5 of her own free will and there is no pressure exerted by anyone and she does not want to have any relation with the petitioner. The age of the Suman Bala is stated to be 23 years.

Looking to the entirety of facts and circumstances, it is not a fit case where indulgence under criminal writ jurisdiction can be granted to the petitioner. The custody of Suman Bala with respondent No.5 cannot be held to be illegal.

Learned counsel for respondent No.6 states that so far as respondent No.6 is concerned he has been wrongly arrayed in the aforesaid petition as he has nothing to do with the matrimonial life of Suman Bala and he is not related to the petitioner as well as respondent No.5 in any manner.

Be that as it may, no interference is called for.

Disposed of.

March 10, 2015.

Atik

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE