

117.

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

CRM-M-34908-2019

Date of decision: 09.01.2020

ANITA KUMARI AND OTHERS

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. S.K. Choudhary, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mrs. Ruchika Sabherwal, AAG, Punjab.

HARI PAL VERMA, J. (Oral)

The petitioners, who are mother-in-law, brother-in-law and father-in-law of the complainant, have filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of F.I.R. No.54 dated 28.05.2018 registered under Sections 498-A, 406 of IPC at Police Station Sujampur, District Pathankot.

When the counsel for the petitioners was put to a specific query as regard the stage of trial, he informed this Court that charges in the case have been framed. He states that the complainant hardly stayed in the matrimonial home for about 1 ½ months whereas for the remaining period, she stayed in the Army Guest House at Pathankot where her husband was posted. He further states that the petitioners are required to appear before the trial Court on each and every date. However, at this stage, the petitioners

would be satisfied in case the presence of petitioner No.3-Ram Lubaiya is exempted from personal appearance, as he is working in Army and presently posted at Mumbai. He seeks withdrawal of the present petition.

In view of the statement of counsel for the petitioners, the present petition is dismissed as withdrawn. The petitioners are at liberty to take all pleas as available to them under law.

However, considering the fact that petitioner No.3-Ram Lubaiya is father-in-law of the complainant and working in Indian Army and presently posted in Mumbai, the trial Court shall not insist his personal appearance unless it is specifically required.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

09.01.2020
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No