

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

Civil Revision No.2424 of 2014
Date of Decision: December 8, 2015

Smt.Reena

...Petitioner

Versus

Ravi Shankar

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr.Saurabh Dalal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Gopal Sharma, Advocate,
for the respondent.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner-wife is aggrieved against the impugned order dated 23.1.2014, whereby her application filed under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act (for short “the Act”) seeking maintenance pendente lite and expenses for proceedings, has not been decided, which reads thus:-

“This is petition under Section 12 of Hindu Marriage Act for annulment of the marriage, on the ground that before the marriage, Respondent was pregnant from other man than the petitioner-husband. An application under Section 24 of Hindu Marriage Act is pending in this petition. Counsel for the petitioner has produced on the record photocopy of the affidavit of Respondent as well as photocopy of some panchayat proceedings wherein it has been mentioned that Respondent has received a sum of Rs.Six lacs from her husband (petitioner) towards the marriage expenses. In view of

this, I am of the considered view that it would be just and appropriate if the petition is expedited. In view of the above, the following issues are hereby framed:-

- 1. Whether the marriage is voidable at the instance of the Petitioner on the ground that Respondent was pregnant from other man than the husband at the time of marriage? OPP.*
- 2. Relief.”*

It has been brought to the notice of this Court that during the pendency of the case, petition under Section 12 of the Act has been decided on 17.1.2015.

In view of the fact that the petitioner-wife has already taken ₹6.00 lacs towards marriage expenses and the petition under Section 12 of the Act has been decided, in essence the marriage has been held to be null and void, no cause of action survives in the present case for claiming maintenance pendente lite. No ground is made out to interfere in the impugned order.

The revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

December 8, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE