

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

132

**CRM-M No. 3580 of 2023 (O & M)
Date of Decision :27.4.2023**

*Gopal Kumar Soni and others**..... Petitioners**versus**State of Haryana and another**..... Respondents*

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. Ajay Kumar Gupta, Advocate, for the petitioners

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA J. (ORAL):

The present petition has been filed for quashing of the FIR No. 212 dated 26.12.2022 under Sections 323, 34, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Women, Bhiwani, and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are maternal uncles and maternal grand-mother of the complainant's husband, and have nothing to do with the matrimonial issues between the complainant and her husband. Her husband is a drug addict and has remained confined to Samapark Foundation, a Drug Counselling and Rehabilitation Centre. Learned counsel has also referred to representation dated 12.11.2022 (Annexure P-4) submitted to the Station House Officer, Women Police Station, Bhiwani, by petitioner no.1 stating that the complainant along with her husband was staying in a rented accommodation of landlord Sohan Lal. It has also been stated therein that she had been living alongwith her children and husband at House

No. 9/49, Ramesh Nagar, New Delhi, since long. On this basis, learned counsel

contends that allegations levelled against the petitioners cannot be believed, nor any offence is made out.

3. Learned State counsel, on instructions from L/HC Sheela, submits that investigation of the case is going on and two of the accused husband and brother-in-law of the complainant, are still to join the investigation.

4. Learned counsel for the parties have been heard.

5. The assertion that the petitioners are distant relatives of the complainant, or that her husband was a drug addict, or that they were residing in a rented accommodation separately, are facts that need to be gone into by the Investigating Agency during investigation, which is in progress. Therefore, there is no ground to entertain the petition for quashing of the FIR.

6. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the petition.

7. Dismissed as withdrawn.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

27.4.2023
Ashwani

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No