

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR(F)-110-2015

Date of Decision : 01.10.2015

Vinod Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Neelam

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Ajay Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

This revision has been filed to challenge the order dated
15.04.2015, passed by District Judge (Family Court), Gurgaon.

On 28.05.2015 the following order was passed :-

CRM-17595-2015

Application is allowed as prayed for.

Copy of jamabandi for the year 2007-2008 (Annexure P-1) marked as Ex. P-2 before the Family Court, Gurgaon is taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

CRR (F)-110-2015

The petitioner is first of all directed to deposit 50% of the arrears of maintenance by 15.07.2015 before the trial Court as it is submitted that petitioner is not able to pay the entire up-to-date arrears in one installment and for rest of the amount, he may be permitted to pay the same in installments and that would be without prejudice to the merits

of instant petition.

List on 23.07.2015.

The petitioner is directed to file compliance affidavit in this regard before the date fixed.

Apart from that, the petitioner is also directed to bring a demand draft to the tune of ₹ 15,000/- towards litigation expenses favouring respondent-wife on the next date of hearing.”

On 23.07.2015 the following order was passed :-

“Compliance of the previous order dated 28.05.2015 has not been made.

Learned petitioner's counsel submits that there is a talk of compromise between the parties.

In the ends of justice, one more but last opportunity is granted to the petitioner to comply with the previous order.

List on 01.10.2015.

It is, however, made clear that if there is no headway made for an amicable settlement of the dispute, the petitioner shall deposit the amount of compensation as stipulated in the order dated 28.05.2015, at least 10 days before the date fixed and file compliance affidavit in this regard.”

Today again learned counsel for the petitioner seeks more time to comply with the aforesaid orders.

In my opinion the conduct of the petitioner shows that he is trying to play hide and seek with the Court. Despite his undertaking he has not paid a single penny to the complainant on the plea that the compromise talks are still going on. The case is lingering in this Court since May, 2015 but till date the petitioner has not been able to strike a compromise and therefore, he does not deserves any concession from this Court.

Consequently, the petition is dismissed.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

01.10.2015

Pooja sharma-I

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**