SHIVANI
2016.09.08 10:33
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document
Chandigarh

Sr. No.219

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 12434 of 2013
Date of decision:02.09.2016

Ricky and another

.....Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Rakesh Kumar Jain

Present: Mr. K.S.Hissowal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Anant Kataria, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Munish Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No. 4.

Rakesh Kumar Jain, J.(Oral)

After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, I do not find any merit in this petition. The only argument raised by counsel for the petitioner is that respondent No. 4 had sworn an affidavit that she will look after the petitioner but the same has not been done and thus, this petition has been filed.

Be that as it may. No cause of action survives in this petition in this regard without violation of any provision of law. However, if the petitioner is having any grievance against respondent No. 4 in respect of the affidavit, he may avail his remedy of civil suit in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

[Rakesh Kumar Jain]
Judge

2nd September, 2016
Shivani Kaushik

Whether Speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No