

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRWP-9627-2021

Date of decision : 14.02.2023

Rajmeet Kaur and another

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana and others

....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed for issuance of a direction to official respondents No.2 and 3 in the nature of *mandamus* to protect the lives and liberty of the petitioners from the hands of private respondents No.4 to 8 and other relatives and not to harass them on any false criminal complaint.

The case of the petitioners is that petitioner No.1 was already married to respondent No.4 – Naveen Kumar, who used to give beatings to her. Thereafter, petitioner No.1 joined the company of petitioner No.2 and started living in live-in relationship.

Order dated 08.10.2021 says as under:-

“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 8.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Rajmeet Kaur-petitioner No.1 performed the marriage with Naveen Kumar - respondent No.4 on 20.10.2012 and out of the said wedlock, a male child, i.e. Sarthak, was born. Since the marriage, petitioner No.1 is being illtreated by respondent No.4 and given beatings. Also so many times, Panchayats were called for. Ultimately, petitioner No.1 went to her parents, i.e. respondents No.6 and 8, but they asked her to return her matrimonial home and stay with respondent No.4. Thereafter, having trauma in her mind, petitioner No.1 has ultimately joined the company of Banty-petitioner No.2 and living with him in his house.

Notice of motion for 21.01.2022.”

Thereafter, on 15.11.2021, the petition was ordered to be dismissed as withdrawn qua petitioner No.1. Today, learned counsel appearing for respondents No. 6 to 8 submits that they are always in support of their daughter, who has already went back to her matrimonial home and thus, they have never created problem in the life of petitioner No.1.

Learned counsel further submits that even there is no threat perception at the hands of the answering respondents to petitioner No.2 also. On 14.02.2022, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioners (petitioner No.2) when the following order was passed:-

“Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Written statement on behalf of respondents No. 6 to 8 filed by respondent No. 7-Nar Singh, is taken on record.

Registry is directed to tag the same at an appropriate place.

At the outset, learned State counsel points out that

the statement of Rajmeet Kaur, who was petitioner No. 1, has been recorded, but qua her petition was dismissed as withdrawn vide order dated 15.11.2021. Learned State counsel prays for time to record the statement of petitioner No. 2-Banty.

On his request, adjourned to 25.04.2022.”

Again, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner No.2, when the case was taken up for hearing on 22.12.2022 and the same was adjourned for 14.02.2023 i.e. today.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

14.02.2023

Nisha-I

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No