

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

CRM-M No.14490 of 2017
Date of Decision: 27.04.2017

KARAMJIT KAUR & OTHERS

-PETITIONERS

VS

STATE OF PUNJAB & OTHERS

-RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

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

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Petitioners seek issuance of necessary directions to the official respondents in the context of protecting their lives and personal liberties from being invaded at the hands of respondents No.6 to 13.

Petitioners No.1 and 2 are the real sisters of Avtar Singh and petitioner No.3 is real brother of Avtar Singh. Avtar Singh was married with respondent No.6 and there was a matrimonial discord. Avtar Singh is living in Canada. Number of litigations started between them and ultimately, a compromise was effected between respondent No.6 and her father-in-law whereby an amount of Rs.4,50,000/- was paid to respondent No.6 and it was settled between the parties that respondent No.6 would obtain divorce on mutual consent. Instead of filing

petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, respondent No.6 ventured to file petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act. The said petition was ultimately dismissed as withdrawn on 12.11.2016.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that even respondent No.6 has contracted second marriage with respondent No.11 even without obtaining lawful divorce from Avtar Singh. Now, respondent No.6 is instrumental in harassing the petitioners by way of filing complaints before the police.

Precisely for the grievance in question, petitioners have also filed a representation dated 06.04.2017 before respondent No.4.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. P.S. Ghuman, Additional A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 5.

At this stage, in view of nature of order which this Court proposes to pass, there is no necessity of filing any reply to the petition as no order prejudicial to interest of any of the party is being passed.

At this stage, without meaning anything on merits of the case, respondent No.4 can be directed to have a fair look on the grievance of the petitioner in the form of representation

dated 06.04.2017 and decide the same by way of passing appropriate order in accordance with law.

Disposed of.

27.04.2017
jjyoti Y.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No