

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRL.W.P. No. 8 of 2016 (O/M)

Date of decision : 15.1.2016

Charan Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Petitioner in person with Mr. Anil Kumar Sharma,
Advocate.

Ms. Supriya Arora, Additional A.G. Haryana.

Ms. Shimla (detenue) in person with
Mr. Lajpat Sharma, Advocate,
for respondents No. 8 to 10.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

:-

:-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Report of the Warrant Officer dated 11.1.2016 received, wherein he stated that Shimla was deliberately not produced before him and it appears that information was leaked out to the opposite party. However, he was assured by the Sarpanch that she (Shimla) will be produced in the Court today.

Today, Shimla (detenue) has been produced before this Court. The State has also submitted the reply. She is accompanied by her counsel. Her statement recorded, in which she has stated

CRL.W.P. No. 8 of 2016 (O/M)

-2-

that she was previously married to one Vipin on 11.4.2015 and that when she had gone to her Bua's house (father's sister), she was enticed away by the present petitioner. She admitted to have filed a petition before this Court for protection i.e. CRM No. M-44274 of 2015 alongwith affidavit, in which she had concealed her earlier marriage. She stated that she is now living with her parents of her own free will and does not want to accompany the petitioner.

Her statement was read over and explained to her in Hindi in the presence of her counsel and she signed the same after admitting it to be correct. She has also produced album of previous marriage with Vipin on 11.4.2015.

In view of the matter, it is found that there is no illegal detention in the present case. Keeping in view the fact that Shimla (detenue) does not appear to be highly educated and appears to be mis-guided girl, no action is required to be taken regarding her wrong averments made in the earlier petition for protection i.e. CRM No. M-44274 of 2015 and affidavit. Hence, the present petition is dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

15.1.2016
sjks