

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

Sr. No.257

**CRWP No. 1789 of 2015  
DECIDED ON: July 04, 2016**

**JOGINDER KAUR**

**..PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS**

**...RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH**

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?

Present: Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

Mr. J.S. Sekhon, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. SPS Sidhu, Advocate,  
for respondents No.5 to 10.

\*\*\*

**JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

This is a criminal writ petition under Articles 226 & 227 of the Constitution of India seeking issuance of a writ in the nature of habeas corpus to direct the respondents to locate and present Gurmail Singh s/o Mehal Singh in Court.

In pursuance of notice of motion issued by this Court, the State has filed a detailed reply in the shape of affidavit of Gurmail Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Dharamkot, District Moga.

**CRWP No. 1789 of 2015**

**--2--**

A glance at the reply reveals that during enquiry all the allegations levelled by the petitioner regarding bounded labour were found to be false and it came to light that Sukhchain Singh had never worked as bounded labour in the house of respondent No.5. It also came to light that Sukhchain Singh and his wife Raj Kaur had sold their house measuring 4 Marlas to respondent No.5 for the consideration of Rs.1,53,000/- and delivered the possession thereof to him, but since the property which is the subject matter of the aforesaid transaction was located within Lal Lakir, the sale deed was not got executed and registered by the parties with the office of Sub-Registrar. Later on, the petitioner resiled from the sale transaction and tried to take possession of the house by using force.

Similarly, the allegations with regard to Gurmail Singh were also found to be false and it was found during inquiry that Gurmail Singh had left the hospital at his own sweet will. Thus, in view of the specific reply, instant petition has rendered infructuous and same is dismissed as such.

However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to have recourse to other remedies available to her under the law.

**July 04, 2016**  
*Ankur*

**(JASPAL SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**