

230.

(By Post)

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

CRWP-783-2017

Date of decision:02.08.2017.

YUSUF

... Petitioner

versus

STATE OF HARYANA

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Bhupender Beniwal, AAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

Petitioner-Mohd. Yusuf son of Abdul Rehman, resident of Shastri Colony, Panipat, has submitted a complaint, addressed to Hon'ble the Chief Justice of this Court that his daughter, namely, Muskan, who is already married with one Shoaib son of Ansar, resident of Ghos Ali, Sector 11-12, HUDA, Panipat on 11.09.2016, has been kidnapped by accused No.1-Vikas son of Vinod on 18.06.2017. The said complaint was registered as CRWP-783-2017.

Pursuant to the notice of motion having been issued by this Court, learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Vinod Kumar, states that earlier Muskan, who got married with Vikas, filed a petition i.e. CRM-M-22352-2017 titled as 'Muskan and another Versus State of Haryana and others' seeking protection to their lives and liberty on the ground that they have contacted inter-religion marriage against the wishes of their parents. The said petition was disposed by this Court

on 20.06.2017. Interestingly, the present petitioner-Mohd. Yusuf was arrayed as respondent No.4 in CRM-M-22352-2017 and at the time when the said petition was taken up for hearing, he had appeared before this Court and opposed the marriage on the ground that Muskan has performed marriage without the consent of the private respondents.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that Muskan and Vikas had approached this Court through CRM-M-22352-2017 which was disposed of on 20.06.2017 with the following observations:-

“After hearing counsel for the petitioners and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case or the validity of the marriage and the age of the petitioners and keeping in view the binding precedent of the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Lata Singh v. State of U.P. and another, 2006(2) SCC (Criminal) 478**, the present petition is disposed of with direction to respondent No.2 to look into the said issue and take necessary action in accordance with law.”

Heard.

Interestingly, the present petitioner-Mohd.Yusuf was present when CRM-M-22352-2017 was disposed of. It is after the decision in CRM-M-22352-2017, the petitioner has moved a fresh complaint. The factum of earlier petition i.e. CRM-M-22352-2017 has not been disclosed in the present complaint.

In view of the fact that the petitioner has concealed the material fact, present petition is dismissed.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

02.08.2017
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No

Whether reportable? Yes/No