

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Crl. Misc. No.M-7964 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: March 18, 2017

Rajveer Kaur and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. K.S. Pannu, DAG, Punjab

Amol Rattan Singh, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that though he has filed an application seeking to place on record the divorce decree, as regards divorce between petitioner no.2 and his first wife, the said application has not been listed. A photocopy of the decree of divorce dated 26.02.2015, passed by the District Judge, Sangrur, has been produced in Court today.

He submits that even the process fee could not be filed as regards notice issued to respondents no.4 to 6.

Notice had already been issued to respondents no.1 to 3 through the learned State counsel present on the last date of hearing, in response to which Mr. K.S. Pannu, learned Deputy Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions from Head Constable Mohinder Singh, submits that as a matter of fact, respondent no.4, i.e. the father of petitioner no.1, had died 16 years ago and that respondent no.5, i.e. the mother of petitioner no.1, has no objection to the marriage of the petitioners. Respondent no.6, Raju

Khan, i.e. brother of petitioner no.1, is stated to be a minor studying in Class 10.

Further, learned State counsel, again on instructions, submits that the factum of the divorce between petitioner no.2 and Rekha Rani, has been confirmed by the SHO, Police Station, Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur (respondent no.3).

As to why the petitioners had impleaded respondent no.4, with petitioner no.1 knowing well that her father had already died 16 years ago, is something not understood.

However, in the aforesaid circumstances, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he does not want to press this petition.

Consequently, this petition is dismissed, though with a direction to respondents no.2 and 3 to otherwise ensure that the lives and liberty of the petitioners continue to be protected, within the four corners of law.

March 18, 2017
vcgarg

(Amol Rattan Singh)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No