

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

**CRWP-7541-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 31.08.2021**

Lakhwinder Kaur and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Vishal Goel, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Avtar Singh Sandhu, Addl. AG Punjab.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

This petition has been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution for issuance of a writ in the nature of mandamus directing respondents No.2 and 3 to protect the life and liberty of the petitioners at the hands of respondents No.4 to 6.

On 11.08.2021, this Court, while issuing notice of motion, noticed the contentions of petitioner No.1, who had appeared in person through video conferencing, to the effect that her husband-Manjeet Singh, who is a habitual drunkard, used to give her beatings after liquor intake; that two children were born out of their wedlock; that due to the maltreatment given by respondent No.4 to her, she had left her matrimonial home and started residing at her parental house, but she had been forced to go to her in-laws' house; that during the said period, she came into the

contact of petitioner No.2 and they both started liking each other and decided to marry each other; that out of the aforesaid two children, one is residing with her and another with respondent No.4, and that the petitioners are now under the constant threats to their life and liberty at the hands of respondents No. 4 to 6.

At this stage, Mr. Pawan Attri, Advocate, appears and files vakalatnama on behalf of respondents No. 4 to 6 through email, which is taken on record. He further states that when respondents No. 4 to 6 had engaged him, they were accompanied by petitioner No.1-Lakhwinder Kaur and that in order to ascertain the identity of said Lakhwinder Kaur, he had seen her Aadhar Card. Mr. Attri further states that now petitioner No.1 is residing happily with her husband-respondent No.4 and she does not have any danger to her life and liberty at the hands of her husband or his family members.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners does not want to press the present petition.

Since petitioner No. 1 has joined the company of her husband and is residing with him in her matrimonial home, no further orders are called for in the present petition. Even otherwise, as noticed above, learned counsel for the petitioners does not want to press the present petition.

Dismissed as not pressed.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

31.08.2021

Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No