

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

CRM No.M-10060 of 2018
Date of Decision : 09.03.2018

Surjeet Kumar

... Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.S.WALIA

Present: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

B.S.WALIA, J. (oral)

Learned counsel contends that the petitioner got married to respondent No.4 on 25.06.2017. However, on 21.07.2017, respondent No.4 went back to her matrimonial home from where she eloped with respondent No.5. On the registration of a missing report by the petitioner, vide dairy No.24 dated 26.07.2017 at Police Station Taragarh, District Pathankot, respondent No.4 returned and thereafter submitted a complaint (Annexure P-1) before the Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot on 29.07.2017, against respondent No.5 levelling allegations of blackmailing and kidnapping and prayed for action against respondent No.5. Thereafter, respondent No.4 submitted another complaint (Annexure P-2) dated 28.08.2017 to Deputy Superintendent of Police, Pathankot, reiterating the allegations contained in earlier complaint (Annexure P-2) dated 29.07.2017, addressed to Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot and requested for action to be taken against respondent No.5. Thereafter, before the Panchayat of village Tara Garh, respondent No.4 gave in writing that

her marriage had been solemnized on 25.06.2017 with the petitioner against her wishes by her father whereas she was not interested in marrying the petitioner and on the contrary she had told her father and other relatives to get her married with respondent No.5. However, her family members did not listen to her and instead performed her marriage with the petitioner. Therefore, she wanted divorce from the petitioner and further that if the petitioner gave her divorce, then her parents and other relatives would not harass him.

2. Grievance of the petitioner is that respondent No.4 has gone back to respondent No.5, whereafter she has started making complaints against the petitioner of his having demanding dowry. The petitioner apprehends that respondent No.4 would implicate him in a false case. The only prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner is that despite his father having given representation to Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot (respondent No.2) apprehending false implication of all family members by respondent No.4, no action has been taken in respect thereto. Learned counsel states that petitioner would be satisfied if the petition is disposed of by directing Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot (respondent No.2) to consider, decide and take action on the representation (Annexure P/4) in accordance with law.

3. Notice of motion to respondent Nos.1 to 3 only at this stage.
Ms. Jaspreet Kaur, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab, who is present in the

Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.1 to 3 and states that she does not oppose the aforementioned limited prayer of the petitioner.

4. In the light of position as noted above, this petition is disposed of by directing Senior Superintendent of Police, Pathankot (respondent No.2) to consider, decide and take action on representation (Annexure P-4), if any warranted, as per law.

5. The petition stands disposed of with aforesaid directions.

(B.S.WALIA)
JUDGE

09.03.2018
rajesh.k.khurana

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No