

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

CRM-M-33248 of 2020

Date of Decision: 16.10.2020

Amrik Singh

Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Priyanshu Kamra, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. H. S. Multani, AAG, Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

The matter is taken up for hearing through video conference
due to COVID-19 situation.

The present petition is filed seeking directions to the official
respondents to take appropriate action against the private respondents in
FIR No.151 dated 3.6.2020, under Sections 363 and 366-A IPC, registered
at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar.

The FIR was registered at the instance of the petitioner raising
a doubt that Rinku Chaudhary had taken away his daughter with an
intention to marry her. In the petition, it is alleged that on 1.6.2020,
daughter of the petitioner was kidnapped but no action was being taken by
the police. A representation dated 4.8.2020 was filed before the

pleadings that daughter of the petitioner and accused, namely, Rinku Chaudhary filed CRWP No. 6751 of 2020 seeking protection. The said petition was disposed of on 3.9.2020 directing Senior Superintendent of Police, Jalandhar to look into the representation.

The petitioner filed Habeas Corpus Petition bearing CRWP No. 7523 of 2020. The same was disposed of on 22.9.2020 directing Commissioner of Police, Jalandhar to decide representation dated 9.9.2020 and in case the grievances raised were genuine, to take appropriate steps for redressal within six weeks. Now the present petition is filed for directions.

Learned counsel for the State appearing on advance notice, on instructions from ASI-Jaswinder Singh, submits that the matter is being looked into and *prima facie* it is a case of the girl leaving the house to marry Rinku Chaudhary against the wishes of her parents. He further submits that under Section 164 Cr.P.C. the statement of Himani Kaushal was recorded wherein she has stated that she had gone with Rinku Chaudhary of her own sweet will.

Considering the facts in totality and especially that directions were issued by this Court in a Habeas Corpus petition, to look into the grievances of the petitioner raised in the representation, no case is made

out for issuance of any further direction to the official respondents, moreso as learned counsel for the State submits that the FIR is being investigated into. The directions sought in this petition are similar to the relief which has already been granted in the earlier petition filed.

The petition is dismissed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

16th October, 2020

mk

- | | | |
|-------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned | : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable | : | Yes / No |