

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1011 of 2015

=====

Vandana Singh, W/o Sujjal Kumar Singh, D/o Sri Jitendra Singh @
Bajinath Singh, Resident of Village- Kali Asthan, Vidya Nagar, Police
Station T.O.P., Madhubani, District Purnea.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Home Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Inspector General of Police, Administration, Government of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Inspector General of Police, Patna, Division Patna.
5. The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Patna.
6. The Senior Superintendent of Police, District Patna.
7. The Superintendent of Police, District Purnia.
8. The Deputy Superintendent of Police, Secretariat, Patna.
9. The Officer-in-Charge cum S.H.O. Jakkanpur Police Station, Patna.
10. The Investigating Officer, Jakkanpur Police Station, Patna.
11. Jitendra Singh @ Bajinath Singh, S/o Raghunandan Singh, Resident of Village K.P. Sarkar Road, Mithapur, B-Area, Police Station Jakkanpur, District Patna.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shekhar Kumar Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dr. A. K.Upadhyay (SC 20)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 03-03-2017 The petitioner Vandana Singh has filed this writ application under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to give protection to herself as well as to her husband Sujjal Kumar Singh as also commanding the respondent no.11, who is father of the petitioner, not to disturb the private life of petitioner and her husband.



Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State-respondents submits that as per his information the parties have reconciled the matter and the police has submitted final form in this case. Though the respondent no.11 has appeared through vakalatnama, but no one appears on behalf of the respondent no.11 probably for the reason of settlement of dispute.

However, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a direction be given to the respondent no.11 not to disturb the matrimonial life of the petitioner as she is already a married girl and has accepted in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. that she has voluntarily married with Sujjal Kumar Singh which was not liked by the brothers and father of petitioner.

Since the petitioner is a major girl, she has every right to choose the future of her life and no one should and can disturb the same including the parents and guardians. In the circumstances, the respondent no.11 is directed not to disturb the private life of petitioner and her husband.

With the aforesaid observation, the writ application stands disposed of.

Arvind/-

(Birendra Kumar, J)

U			
---	--	--	--

