

238 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

2025 PHHC:180485



CRM-M-3536-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.11.2025

PARMINDER SINGH ... PETITIONER
VERSUS
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER ... RESPONDENTS

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S.GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Rohit Joshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar Jangra, A.A.G., Haryana.

H.S. GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of Complaint bearing No. COMI-659-2018 titled as 'Court of Rajat Verma Civil Judge (Junior Division)-cum-JMIC, on its own motion Karnal through the reader Vs. Parminder Singh" (Annexure P-1) u/s 193, 196, 199 and 200 IPC, and further for quashing of the order dated 08.12.2018 (Annexure P-2) passed by the learned JMIC, Karnal in the Complaint case titled as "Jasvir Kaur Vs. Parminder Singh" under Section 340 Cr.P.C bearing case No. 59/2015 (Annexure P-3).

2. It has been stated that the petitioner had wrongly put his status in the application under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act as 'unmarried' whereas he was a divorcee. This fact also stood corrected vide order dated 07.10.2015 passed in CR-6605-2015 of this Hon'ble High Court. The operative part whereof reads as under:-

"Ex facie, all what was sought to be pleaded by the respondent, vide a proposed amendment was that inadvertently in para No.2 of his petition, he had mentioned

his status as “unmarried” at the time of marriage with the petitioner whereas, he indeed was a divorcee, post dissolution of his first marriage. So much so, even the petitioner does not dispute this position. That being so, the proposed amendment was merely clarificatory in nature and was sought to plead nothing but the truth. Concededly, issues are yet to be framed and the proceedings are still at the initial stage. The amendment prayed for, being crucial, was rightly granted by the Court.

That being so, no interference in exercise of revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is warranted. The petition being devoid of merit is accordingly dismissed.”

3. In view of this, once the status is corrected, therefore, the ground for filing the present complaint does not exist since the only plea was that the Court has been misled and misrepresented.

4. In the light of the above, the abovementioned complaint is quashed and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, if any, also stand quashed.

5. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(H.S.GREWAL)
JUDGE

18.11.2025

Janki

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