

CRWP No. 3663-2021

Date of Decision: 25.10.2021

Renu Devi and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Lokesh Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Munish Sharma, A.A.G., Haryana.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Case heard via video conferencing.

On 16.04.2021, the following order had been passed by this
court:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioners has stated that the marriage of petitioner no.1 was solemnized with respondent no.7 and matrimonial dispute has cropped up between them. Petitioners are residing together and are in live in relationship. They have already submitted a representation to respondent no.2 seeking protection to their life and liberty. It has also been stated that as per information of the petitioners, an FIR has also been registered at the instant of private respondents against petitioner no.2.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Rajneesh Chadwal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Learned State counsel submits that he has not received copy of the paper-book. Learned counsel for the petitioners has assured to pass over the paper-book to the learned State counsel during the course of the day. Learned State counsel also seeks time to furnish the status report.

Adjourned to 23.04.2021.”

Thereafter, an affidavit of the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Headquarters, Rewari, dated 03.05.2021, has been filed, which is ordered to be taken on record.

Along with the said affidavit, a report of the person in-charge of Police Post Dahina, dated 26.04.2021, has been annexed as Annexure R-1, with that report in fact being a statement of respondent no. 7 (Karamveer, who is in fact the husband of petitioner no. 1), to the effect that though he had got registered FIR no. 78, dated 01.04.2021, alleging therein the commission of an offence punishable under the provisions of Section 366 of the IPC, at Police Station Khol, District Rewari, however, as petitioner no. 1 had recorded a statement under the provisions of Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. before the learned Magistrate concerned, to the effect that she wishes to reside with petitioner no. 2 (Nitesh), he (Karamveer) had no objection thereto, with him further stating that he had never threatened to kill his wife but would instead be seeking a divorce from her.

Learned State counsel has pointed out that even as per the reply, if any further protection is required by the petitioners, they would be duly granted such protection.

That being so, this petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous but with a direction to respondents no. 1 to 3 to ensure

that the life and liberty of the petitioners is duly protected, they being adults who have decided to be in a live-in relationship with each other.

October 25, 2021
nitin

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	No.