

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

102

**CRWP-11588-2022
Decided on : 25.01.2023**

Parwinder Kaur and another

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: None for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Anmol Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab
for respondents No.1 to 3.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

Instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is for seeking directions to respondents No.2 and 3 for protection of lives and liberty of petitioners from the hands of private respondents No. 4 to 8.

Although there was no notice, yet on advance notice, Mr. Dinesh Kumar, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of respondents No.4 to 8 and files his Vakalatnama in Court today, which is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

Counsel appearing for respondents No.4 to 8 points out that petitioner No.1 was already married to Sonu Singh-respondent No.4 and from the said wedlock, a son was also born.

Counsel further submits that due to some temperamental differences, petitioner No.1-Parwinder Kaur had left matrimonial home as well as her parental home and started living with petitioner No.2-Hardeep Singh. However, a good sense has now prevailed to her and has now come

back to her parental home i.e. to respondents No.5 to 8.

On 09.12.2022, counsel for the petitioners did not appear and the matter was adjourned to 22.12.2022.

Again, despite calling the case twice, there was no representation from the side of petitioners on 22.12.2022.

Today again, there is no representation on behalf of counsel for petitioners.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

January 25, 2023

k.nain

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*

Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*