

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-29404-2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 18.02.2020

Pankaj Bali

.... Petitioner

Versus

Satish Chand Goel and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: - Mr. Amit Jaiswal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Simranjeet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Kulvir Narwal, Advocate for the respondents.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Through this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., order dated 15.12.2014 (Annexure P-1) of trial Court, dismissing complaint of petitioner and order dated 15.04.2015 (Annexure P-2), of revisional Court, have been assailed, whereby it affirming the aforesaid order of trial Court, dismissed revision of petitioner.

Briefly, petitioner filed a complaint against the respondents under Sections 494, 506 and 341 read with Section 34 IPC, on the allegations that his marriage with respondent No. 2-Geetu, was solemnized on 16.05.1995, according to Hindu Rites and Ceremonies. It was a love marriage. They cohabited as husband and wife till 15.01.1996. However, no child had born out of their wedlock. On 15.01.1996, respondent No. 1-Satish Chand Goel, father-in-law of

petitioner illegally confined respondent No. 2. Resultantly, petitioner filed CRWP-1016-1996 (Annexure P-7) before this Court which was disposed of vide order dated 22.08.1996 (Annexure P-8), because of refusal of his wife-respondent No. 2 to accompany the petitioner. Thereafter, respondent No. 1, secretly performed second marriage of his daughter with respondent No. 3-Pranav Gupta, in October, 2008, knowing well that she was already married. When the petitioner came to know about above second marriage of his wife, he approached the respondents, who, in turn, threatened him with dire consequences. Thus, they committed offences under Sections 494, 506 and 341 read with Section 34 IPC.

The trial Court after recording preliminary evidence finding no *prima facie* case to summon the respondent, dismissed complaint vide order dated 15.12.2014 (Annexure P-1.)

Being aggrieved, petitioner approached the revisional Court, but remained un-successful as his revision too was dismissed vide order dated 15.04.2015 (Annexure P-2)

Heard.

Having given thoughtful consideration to the rival submissions, this Court is not inclined to exercise its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., inasmuch as, learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any legal or genuine reason for exercising the same.

Both the Courts below have recorded concurrent findings against the petitioner while dismissing his complaint. Perusal of

impugned orders shows that they are well reasoned based on correct appreciation of preliminary evidence led by the petitioner.

Dismissed.

February 18, 2020

rishu

(RAMENDRA JAIN)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No