

CRWP-4847-2023

- 1 -

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

211

CRWP-4847-2023
Decided on : 29.05.2023

Dabbu Singh and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Jaswinder Singh.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. In the present protection petition, on 19.05.2023, after hearing
counsel for the petitioners, following order was passed:-

“1. On the very outset, counsel for the petitioners points out
that earlier petition filed before this Court i.e. CRWP-4730-2023 was
permitted to be withdrawn with liberty to file a fresh one by this Court,
vide order dated 17.05.2023, which says as under:

“PRESENT: Mr. Vivek Aggarwal, Advocate for the
petitioners. ****

1. Learned counsel for the petitioners seeks
permission to withdraw the present petition with liberty
to file afresh one with complete and correct particulars.
2. Dismissed as withdrawn, with liberty as sought
and recorded here above.”

2. Petitioner No.1- Dabbu Singh, aged 29 years and
petitioner No.2-Sapna, aged 28 years, have filed instant petition for
seeking directions for protection of their lives and liberty, which is at
danger at the hands of respondents No.4 to10.

3. Counsel for the petitioners submits that respondent No.9-
Reema is sister of petitioner No.2 and is married to Sonu, who is
brother of petitioner No.1-Dabbu Singh. All other private respondents
are parents, brother-in-law (Rinku) and real sisters of petitioner No.2.

4. Counsel for the petitioners further submits that petitioner

No.1 is an illiterate person but petitioner No.2 has done her education up to matriculation. He also submits that petitioner No.2 has been visiting the matrimonial home of her sister i.e. respondent No.4-Reema at village Mandi Killianwali, Malout, Punjab. Counsel submits that only objection to the family of petitioner No.2 is that her family members do not want to marry their two daughters in same house and also for the reason that petitioner No.1 is an illiterate person.

5. *Counsel for the petitioners also submits that in regard to the regular visits of petitioner No.2 at the house of petitioner No.1, explanation has been given in paragraph No.4 of the petition. Relevant para of which says as under:*

“It is pertinent to mention here that the petitioner No.1 use to visit house of petitioner No.2 at her Village alongwith his real brother and petitioner No.2 oftenly use to visit the house of petitioner No.1 at Punjab, as her real sister is residing there. One another brother namely Rajpal of petitioner No.1 is also married in the same village of petitioner No.2 and they used to meet each since they like and developed their relation with each other.”

6. *Thus, being resident in the State of Punjab, petitioners all the time apprehend that the family members come over the matrimonial home in the State of Punjab and may cause interference in the peaceful lives of the petitioners.*

7. *Notice of motion for 29.05.2023.*

8. *On asking of Court, Mr. JS Arora, DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3(State), and seeks time to file status report.*

9. *Remaining respondents No.4 to 10 be served through ordinary as well as through registered post.*

10. *Since this Court has set reservations about the jurisdiction, at the first instance, learned State counsel is directed to verify the antecedents of both the petitioners, in specific, qua the fact that since when petitioner No.2 is visited in State of Punjab as stated in the present petition and would submit its report on or before next date of hearing.*

11. *In the meantime, respondent No.2-Senior Superintendent of Police, Shri Muktsar Sahib, is directed to examine the representation dated 15.05.2023 (Annexure P-5) already submitted and in case any substance of truth is found in the same, appropriate steps be taken for the security of lives and liberty of the petitioners.”*

2. Learned State counsel, on instructions from ASI Jaswinder Singh, states that both the petitioners have got recorded their respective statements before the police, wherein, they have stated that as of now, there is no threat perception to their lives and thus, they do not require any police protection.
3. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel in Court today, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks withdrawal of present petition.
4. Dismissed as withdrawn.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

May 29, 2023
J.Ram

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