

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRWP No. 1050 of 2017
Date of Decision: 29.09.2017

Deepak

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of U.T. Chandigarh and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Ms. Sanjeev K. Virk, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Sharma, APP, UT, Chandigarh.

Mr. Puneet Sharma, Advocate
for respondents no. 4 and 5.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

Heard.

Learned APP, U.T. Chandigarh on instructions from ASI Ranjit Singh submits that the police has contacted Sonika and has recorded her statement, who is not willing to live with the petitioner.

Learned counsel for respondents no. 4 and 5 has also placed on file reply and copy of petition filed by Sonika against the petitioner and his relatives under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. He submits that the petitioner despite notice has not appeared in that case and was proceeded *ex parte*.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that marriage of petitioner with Sonika was a love marriage and she has filed the petition under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 at the behest of her parents.

On going through the petition (Annexure R-4/1), I find that

Sonika has levelled serious allegations against the petitioner, which he can contest before the Court, where the same is filed.

Keeping in view above facts, I find no reason to proceed further with this petition and the same is dismissed.

It is, however, made clear that nothing observed herein shall be taken as opinion of this Court on any aspect of the case and matrimonial dispute between the parties.

September 29, 2017
jk

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: ***Yes/No***

Whether Reportable: ***Yes/No***