

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

Crl. Misc. No.M-17635 of 2016

Date of Decision: 20.05.2016

Santosh

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

BEFORE :- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE DAYA CHAUDHARY

- 1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment ? (Yes/No)**
- 2. To be referred to reporters or not ? (Yes/No)**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest ? (Yes/No)**

Present:- Mr. Rishu Mahajan, Advocate
for Mr. B.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioner.

DAYA CHAUDHARY, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C for issuance of direction to respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and respondent No.4 have solemnized marriage on 18.06.2015. After sometime, it came to the knowledge of the petitioner that respondent No.4 was earlier married to one Pooja Bhargav and there was no divorce from her. The petitioner left the matrimonial home as it was not a marriage in the eyes of law. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner is being harassed by respondent No.4 and a threat is also being given to her. The petitioner has filed a representation in the Office of

Superintendent of Police, Sirsa on 12.05.2016 but no action has been taken thereupon so far.

Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that the petitioner would be satisfied, in case, the directions are issued to respondents No.2 and 3 to take action on the representation as the same is still pending.

Without commenting anything on the merits of the case and keeping in view the limited prayer, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondent No.2 to consider the representation moved by the petitioner and take necessary action thereupon in accordance with law within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order after verifying the facts from the other party and also after hearing both the sides.

It is also made clear that nothing has been said on merits regarding the facts mentioned in the petition.

The petition is disposed of accordingly.

20.05.2016
gurpreet

(DAYA CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE