



CRM-M-21077-2026 (O&M)

-1-

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

131

CRM-M-21077-2026 (O&M)

Date of decision: 21.04.2026

PARMINDER SINGH

...Petitioner

VERSUS

VEERPAL KAUR AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Piyush Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of order dated 06.03.2026 of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Ferozepur in case No. MNT-125/450/2021 dated 02.09.2021 titled *Veerpal Kaur and Another Vs. Parminder Singh* arising out of application under Section 125 Cr.P.C.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Ferozepur erroneously dismissed petitioner's application for permission to take photographs for comparing disputed and admitted signatures of respondent No.1 and her father Harbans Singh. He claimed that in reply to the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. filed by respondent No. 2, petitioner had taken a categoric defence that his marriage was a nullity as respondent No. 1 had a prior subsisting marriage with one Arwinder Singh, which was solemnized on 24.03.2019 at *Gurudwara Saragarhi Sahib*. Respondent No. 1 in cross-examination denied her first marriage. Therefore, petitioner examined *Head Granthi* of *Gurudwara Saragarhi Sahib* to prove the



original marriage register containing the entries and signatures of respondent No. 1 pertaining to her marriage with Arwinder Singh. Since respondent No. 1 denied her signatures, it was imperative to prove the same through scientific evidence for which the petitioner moved application before the Court to take permission for photographs of the admitted signatures of respondent No. 1 and of her father for comparison with the disputed signatures, which was erroneously dismissed. Petitioner had a right to prove that his marriage with respondent No. 1 was not legal; that she was not his legally wedded wife and could not be denied the opportunity to lead evidence to this effect. He prayed that the order being illegal was liable to be set aside.

3. The application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. was filed by respondent No. 1-Veerpal Kaur and her minor daughter against the petitioner. In the written statement, petitioner admitted that his marriage with respondent No. 1 was solemnized on 01.12.2019, though he claimed that respondent No. 1 was earlier married with one Arwinder Singh. During the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner referred to judgment (Annexure P-10) of the court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Ferozepur in a petition under Section 13 of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 for dissolution of the marriage. The petition was filed by the petitioner and was allowed *ex parte* holding that marriage between the petitioner and respondent No. 1 was dissolved by a decree of divorce w.e.f. 13.10.2023. Though, the allegation of respondent No. 1-Veerpal Kaur being already married with Arwinder Singh finds mention in the divorce petition, the fact remains that marriage of petitioner and respondent No. 1 has been dissolved by decree of divorce by a competent Court of law. The divorce decree

**CRM-M-21077-2026 (O&M)****-3-**

has never been challenged and has attained finality. This being the position, the petitioner cannot be heard to contend that his marriage with the respondent was not legal and valid, particularly when the parties have cohabited together for 02 years after the marriage and petitioner has fathered child of respondent No. 1. Unlike in matrimonial proceedings, where strict proof of marriage is essential, proceedings under Section 125 Cr.P.C. are summary in nature, meant to prevent destitution and vagrancy. The standard of proof of marriage in Section 125 Cr.P.C. proceedings is not as strict as is required in other criminal proceedings. Petitioner having divorced respondent No. 1, cannot turn around and say that his marriage with respondent No.1 was not legal and valid.

4. Finding of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Ferozepur that the Court was only required to determine whether applicants would be entitled to maintenance, is based on correct appreciation. Comparison of signatures of respondent No. 1 with her alleged signatures on register of *Gurudwara Saragarhi Sahib* would not serve any purpose in the proceedings under Section 125 Cr.P.C.

5. There is no apparent illegality or perversity in the impugned order requiring interference of this Court by invoking inherent powers. As such, the petition is dismissed.

6. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as an opinion on merits of the case.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

April 21, 2026*Ajay Goswami*

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