

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

SANJIV KUMAR SHARMA
2015.01.14 15:37
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

CRM No. M-984 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 12.1.2015

Joginder Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Meena and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Harvinder Pal Singh Ghuman, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?
- .- -.-

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that in the petition under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Panipat, had granted the interim maintenance to the tune of Rs. 3,500/- per month to the wife, vide order dated 31.5.2012 (Annexure-P-1) and upheld the same order in another application made by the petitioner under Section 25(2) of the said Act dated 19.8.2013 (Annexure-P-2).

It is stated that certain facts were concealed and the petitioner filed an application for modification of the said order, but the same was dismissed. The order of the learned JMJC, Panipat, was upheld by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Panipat, vide order dated 19.11.2014 (Annexure-P-3).

After going through the order, I am of the view that the fact that the wife was working on temporary basis was considered by the two Courts below. Therefore, there was no concealment. The Courts below have taken into consideration all the facts and circumstances. Therefore, there is no ground to interfere with the said orders in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

Dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

12.1.2015
sjks