

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

103

CRWP-2846-2023

Decided on : 22.05.2023

Khushleen Kaur and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Munish Raj Chaudhari, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. GPS Bal, Advocate
for the private respondents.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. In the present protection petition, after hearing the counsel for the petitioners on 23.03.2023, following order was passed:

“Petitioner No.1 – Khushleen Kaur, aged about 18 years, and petitioner No.2 – Navdeep Singh, aged above 24 years, have filed present petition for seeking protection to their lives and liberty, which is in danger at the hands of respondents No.4 to 7.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that both the petitioners have performed their marriage on 17.03.2023, which is the first marriage of both the petitioners.

However, during the course of arguments, Mr. Satnam Singh, Advocate and Mr. Pardeep S. Bal, Advocate, jointly put in appearance on behalf private respondents, and submit that petitioner No.2 has concealed the material information while filing present petition before this Court, as he performed ‘Karewa Marriage’ with the wife of his deceased brother. After abandoning her, petitioner No.2 again performed the second marriage, and thus, present marriage would be third marriage, which was performed duping petitioner No.1 and her family members.

Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks a short adjournment to get instructions in this regard.

Adjourned to 18.05.2023.

Meanwhile, learned counsel appearing for the private respondents would file their respective Vakalatnamas in registry.”

2. On next date of hearing i.e. on 18.05.2023, none appeared on behalf of the petitioners for giving clarification for the fact which is highlighted in the previous order dated 23.03.2023.

3. Today, Mr. Munish Raj Chaudhari, Advocate, while appearing for the petitioners states that said fact was never brought to his notice, therefore same couldn't be mentioned in the petition. Thus, counsel seeks withdrawal of the present petition. Counsel further submits that since there is concealment of fact, he is not interested in pursuing the prayer made in the petition by the petitioners. Moreover, despite granting opportunities & making efforts, no one is contacting him for clarification purpose.

4. Mr. Munish Raj Chaudhari, Advocate, further promises that in future, he will never file any such petition/reply without collecting complete facts from the petitioners and thus, he seeks withdrawal of the present petition.

5. Dismissed as withdrawn.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 22, 2023

k.nain

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*