



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

241

CRM-M-16550-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision:23.07.2024

Bharat and another Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate for
Mr. Sanjeev Kr. Panwar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Deepshikha Chauhan, A.A.G., Haryana.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No.81 dated 16.02.2017 under Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of Immoral Traffic Prevention Act and Section 120B of IPC registered at Police Station City Palwal District Palwal (Annexure P-1) qua the petitioners and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Learned counsel for the respondent-State on instructions from ASI Prem Singh, submits that in the present case challan was presented on 05.04.2017; charges were framed on 08.08.2017 whereafter the trial commenced and out of 11 witnesses 2 stand examined. The next date of hearing before the learned trial Court is 24.07.2024.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has very vehemently tried to impress upon this Court that there is an affidavit of the father of the petitioner No.1 (petitioner No.1 is husband of petitioner No.2), attesting



to the facts that although the petitioners were present in Krishna Guest House, however, they were taking lunch in the hotel.

Learned counsel for the State vehemently opposes the submission made on behalf of the petitioners and refers to para 5 of the reply on merits of the reply dated 31.08.2017/06.09.2017 filed by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, City Palwal on behalf of respondents No. 1 and 2, wherein it is stated as follows:-

“That the contents of para no.5 of the petition are wrong and denied as both the petitioners were arrested from the room of the hotel and they were found in compromising position and both of them made their confessional statement and they were found guilty of the said offence, hence challan was also filed against them and now charges are to be framed against them.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners is unable to controvert the above said facts.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he may be permitted to withdraw present petition.

Permitted to do so.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

Pending application, if any, stands disposed of.

23.07.2024
Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No