

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

222

CRM-M-33941-2019

Date of Decision: 16.11.2022

Seema Rani

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.Kuldeep V. Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.J.P.Ratra, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Dinesh Maurya, Advocate for
Mr. S.K.Rattan, Advocate
for respondents No.6 and 7.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner through instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is seeking directions to official respondents to locate respondent No.6 and protect her life and liberty from the hands of respondents No.7 to 9.

The case of the petitioner is that respondent No.6 is daughter of the petitioner and she has been confined by respondents No. 7 to 9 who are involved in human trafficking and respondent No.6 has also been dragged in the same business.

Learned State counsel submits that respondent No.6 filed CRM-M-4878-2018 before this Court seeking protection of life and liberty which came to be disposed of by this court vide order dated 05.02.2018. This court directed the parties to appear before Secretary, District Legal Services Authority-cum-District & Sessions Judge, Roopnagar on 15.02.2018.

Pointing out para 4 of the reply dated 30.09.2019 by State, learned State counsel submits that an independent inquiry was conducted by SSP, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar. The respondents No.6 and 7 appeared before the police authorities and tendered their statements wherein they disclosed that they are major and living together as per their own free will.

On being asked, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that till date, respondent No.6 is staying with other respondents and she is not in contact with the petitioner.

The respondent No.6 is indubitably major and she had filed CRM-M-4878-2018 before this Court whereby parties were directed to appear before Secretary, District Legal Services Authority-cum-District & Sessions Judge, Roopnagar.

The police has already investigated the matter and respondent No.6 had already tendered her statement disclosing that she is major and does not want to leave company of respondent No.7.

In view of report of the State as well as order dated 05.02.2018 passed by this Court, no further order is warranted.

Accordingly, petition is disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

16.11.2022
anju

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>