



CRM-M-34732-2025

112

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-34732-2025

Date of Decision: 09.07.2025

Rajesh Mann

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Naveen Siwach, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Trishanjali Sharma, D.A.G., Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

1. Seeking initiation of inquiry against respondent No.2 for making a false affidavit before this Court in CRWP No.2133 of 2025, petitioner (her husband) has come up before this Court under Section 379 BNSS r/w 528 BNSS for taking appropriate legal action.

2. I have heard counsel for the petitioner to ascertain that whether the petition is worth issuing notice or not and its analysis would lead to the following outcome. Petitioner claims that he was married with respondent No.2 on 16.12.2002 and they were living at Delhi. It was petitioner's second marriage because his first wife has expired due to health issues. In May, 2024 respondent No.2 went to her maternal home at Hisar and started living with her parents. After few days, she changed her Aadhar address from Delhi to Narwana. In November, she again came to her matrimonial home and assured the petitioner not to leave home again. However, on 06.01.2025, respondent No.2 went missing and when he searched for her, she was not traceable and even her mobile was switched off, as such he filed missing report in Police Station Alipur, Delhi. On 30.01.2025, at 11.20 PM he received a call from one person Kailash Bishnoi who threatened him not to trouble her by searching for her. After that, petitioner filed a writ in the nature of Habeas Corpus to issue directions to Delhi Police to trace the petitioner. On 10.03.2025, respondent No.2 was produced where she stated that she was residing in Gujarat with Rajesh Jhakkar with whom she was in live-in relationship and she will never go with the petitioner. Petitioner has annexed copy of the writ petition as Annexure P-1.



CRM-M-34732-2025

3. In this order, the Hon'ble Delhi High Court mentioned the factum of petitioner's marriage with Seema Devi on 16.12.2022 and after mentioning all the facts vide detailed order also observed in para no.11 that she did not want to live with petitioner and did not want to keep any relationship with him and their children and wanted to continue to live in live-in relationship with respondent No.2 in the said petition as recorded in the said order. In para no.13, undertaking by the parties was also recorded by the Hon'ble Delhi High Court which reads as follows:

"13. The undertaking on behalf of the parties including the statement of Ms. Seema that she does not wish to press any criminal complaint that she has filed against her husband is also taken on record. Further, considering the facts and circumstances, the Court observes as under:

(i) Since Ms. Seema is clear that she does not wish to accompany the husband or live with her family, she is allowed to proceed as per her own wishes.

(ii) She is free to pursue the divorce petition before the concerned Court in accordance with law.

(iii) Let Ms. Seema be released from Nari Niketan. She may be sent to the safehouse from where she was picked up, for production before the concerned Court.

(iv) Let today's order be furnished by the Petitioner and his family to the Haryana Police to enable them to proceed as per the statements recorded above."

4. Petitioner submits that now respondent No.2 has filed a divorce petition against him in District Court, Narwana in which she stated that she was married to the petitioner and also made false complaints whereas this fact is incorrect and she gave false affidavit. He further submits that she had married for property and for jewellery and has given all that money and jewellery to respondent No.2. She is under threat of the respondent and as such he was seeking legal action for filing false affidavit regarding place of marriage.

5. Perusal of the entire petition reveals that now the petitioner is trying to settle his personal score as now litigation started between them. This Court does not want to become part of personal agenda. Even if entire allegations are taken to be true, it is not a case where this Court should take a serious note by initiating inquiry against petitioner's wife. Over all, it points out that it is a case of involving petitioner's wife in multiple litigations. It may be a tactic and strategy to put pressure on her. This Court would restrain and refrain from such private disputes.



CRM-M-34732-2025

6. Given above, it is not a case worth issuing notice and the same is accordingly, dismissed. All pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

09.07.2025
Jyoti Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.