

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

**CRM No. M-11731 of 2016
Date of decision: 29.09.2016**

Dimple @ Sandhya

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. J.P. Dhull, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. D.R. Singla, DAG, Haryana.

Ritu Bahri, J.

Petitioner is seeking direction to the official respondents to protect her life and liberty from respondent Nos. 4 to 8.

Dimple @ Sandhya-petitioner was married to respondent No.4- Naresh Chaurasia in accordance with Hindu rites and ceremonies. It was a love marriage. Out of this wedlock, two children were born. After some time, the behaviour of respondent No.4 has changed and he started harassing and humiliating the petitioner. His atrocities increased day by day and it became impossible for her to stay with him. Ultimately, the petitioner left her matrimonial house and started living with Lakha Singh, who gave her shelter in his house. At present, the petitioner is living with Lakha Singh voluntarily, without any fear or coercion, who is keeping her nicely and providing food etc. to her. Said Lakha Singh was a married person, but his

wife had died.

Upon notice, reply on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3, by way of affidavit of Deputy Superintendent of Police, Kaithal, has been filed, wherein it has been stated that after receipt of notice, facts of this case have been got verified through SHO Police Station, Pundri. He recorded the statements of Randhir Singh, Chowkidar, village Kheri Matrwa as well as respondent Nos. 5 and 6 and found that Lakha Singh son of Malkhan Singh was earlier married about 10 years back and had three children (two sons and one daughter) from that marriage. Wife of Lakha Singh has died about three months back. Presently, children of Lakha Singh are residing with his mother at village Matrwa Kheri. The respondents have no objection to the relationship of petitioner with Lakha Singh. Respondent No.4 is the husband of petitioner and he used to reside at Mumbai. Respondents are not interfering in the life of Lakha Singh and the petitioner.

It has been further stated that the petitioner and Lakha Singh have not approached the police for any protection and in future, if they will approach the police, their prayer will be considered in accordance with law.

In view of the aforesaid reply filed on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3, no further orders are required to be passed in this petition.

Disposed of accordingly.

29.09.2016
ajp

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No