

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

**C.R. No.4017 of 2012
Date of Decision.24.03.2015**

Rohit KumarPetitioner

Versus

SushilaRespondent

Present: None for the petitioner.

Mr. Pardeep Panwar, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Lochab, Advocate
for the respondent.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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?

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. The revision petition is against the order passed for interim maintenance under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act. There is no representation for the petitioner. The counsel for the respondent is present but he is also not in a position to apprise the Court of the facts of the case.

2. The revision petition is dismissed for default of appearance and non-prosecution. Any application for restoration shall be entertained by the registry only if there is an affidavit filed that all the arrears of maintenance have been paid by the petitioner.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 24, 2015
Pankaj*