

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205

CRWP-10952-2022 (O&M)
Decided on : 11.05.2023

Harjeet Kaur and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: None for the petitioners.

Mr. J. S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Lakhsay Jindal, Advocate for respondents No. 4 to 8.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. On the previous date of hearing i.e. on 24.03.2023, from the reply filed by the State counsel, it is noticed that petitioner No. 1-Harjeet Kaur has already returned back and joined the company of respondent No. 4-Madan Singh, who is husband of petitioner No. 1.

Said order dated 24.03.2023 passed by this Court, says as under:

*“Present: Mr. Kulbir Singh, Advocate for
Mr. RS Sekhon, Advocate,
for the petitioner(s).*

*Mr. JS Arora, DAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Sukhwinder Singh.*

At the outset, learned State counsel has filed the reply dated 24.03.2023, by way of affidavit of DSP, Sub-Division Abohar, Distt. Fazilka, on behalf of respondents No.1 to 3, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions. Office to tag the same at appropriate place.

A copy thereof has been handed over to the counsel for the petitioners.

While referring to Para No.4 of the said reply, learned State counsel submits that petitioner No.1 – Harjeet Kaur has already made a statement of her returning back to join the company of respondent No.4 –

Madan Singh, who is her husband. Counsel for the petitioners seeks some time to verify the said fact.

Besides above, as per office report, notice could not be issued for want of process fee.

Counsel for the petitioners expresses regret for the lapse and assures that needful shall be done promptly.

On filing of fresh requisite process fee, let fresh notice be issued to unserved respondents for 11.05.2023. ”

2. Today there is no representation on behalf of the petitioners.
3. However, looking at the reply filed by the State counsel, which has also been confirmed by counsel for respondents no. 4 to 8, I do not find any substance in the present petition for allowing of the prayer made in the present petition. Moreover, petitioner No. 1 is already married and has joined the company of the matrimonial home. Accordingly, present petition stands disposed of.
4. Disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

11.05.2023

Riya

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