



CR-5035-2024

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(125)

CR-5035-2024

Date of Decision: - 03.09.2024

Sunil Verma and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Neha Rana

.....Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Grover, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

1. Present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the summoning order dated 06.05.2023 (Annexure P-4) passed by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panipat.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the matter is now fixed for 22.10.2024 for appearance of the petitioners and has further submitted that on account of the judgment dated 24.04.2023 titled as “***Jaspal Kaur @ Pinki and others Vs. State of Punjab and another***”, ***passed in CRM-M-19553-2023*** by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, the present revision petition is being filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

3. Para 10 of the said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“10. This Court has observed that everyday petitions are



filed before this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. assailing petition filed under Section 12 and notice under Section 13 of DV Act. It has further been noticed that parties are filing revision petition under Section 397/401 Cr.P.C. against order passed by Appellate Court under Section 29 of DV Act.

In view of judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court, Full Bench of Madras High Court and with intent to minimise litigation especially against distant and sundry relatives, before parting with this judgment, this Courts finds it appropriate to issue following directions to Magistrates posted within the jurisdiction of this Court:

(i) In case of petition under Section 12 of DV Act, all the respondents may not be mechanically issued notice under Section 13 of DV Act. Notice at the first instance may not be issued to distant relatives. The Magistrate is expected to apply his mind qua distant and sundry relatives of the respondents arrayed by aggrieved person.

(ii) The presence of respondents may not be required where respondents are represented through counsel;

(iii) In case application is filed by the respondents on the ground of jurisdiction or maintainability or deletion from array of respondents, the Magistrate is expected to pass an appropriate order;

(iv) In case an application is filed seeking alteration, modification or revocation of order passed under the Act, the Magistrate in terms of Section 25 of DV Act is expected to pass an order, if parties are able to show change of circumstances."

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in view of the above-said judgment, the petitioners be permitted to withdraw the present revision petition with liberty to file an application in terms of the said judgment.

5. Dismissed as withdrawn, with the liberty aforesaid, subject to



CR-5035-2024

-3-

the averment made in para 11 of the present petition to the effect that the case is now fixed for 22.10.2024 for appearance, is correct and in case, the said averment is incorrect, the present revision petition would be deemed to be dismissed.

September 03, 2024
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No