

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

CWP No. 1940 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: January 28, 2015

Mrs. Meenakshi Gupta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T., Chandigarh and another

...Respondents

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?**

Present: Mr. MS Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Arvind Moudgil, Advocate
the respondent No.2.

K. KANNAN, J. (Oral)

1. The order passed by the District Magistrate-cum-Appellate Authority dated 6.2.2014 will require to be quashed for the simple reason that the said order in modification of the earlier one passed on 30.1.2014 has been made without joining the petitioner, namely, the daughter-in-law and the grand son of the applicant in the inquiry before such order was passed. The counsel for the applicant before the court below has also no objection, if a reasoned decision is taken within a timeframe after hearing objections from the petitioner before this court.

2. The order dated 6.2.2014 is accordingly quashed and the petitioner will file her objection to the modification application filed by the applicant before the appellate authority within a period of two weeks. On

such objection being filed, the parties will be heard by the appellate authority on any date within four weeks and a decision taken and communicated to the parties.

3. The writ petition is disposed of with the above observations. In the meantime, the petitioner shall allow for the mother-in-law to enter upon the front portion of the house and use toilet, in the manner that an undertaking had been given by her before this court. If there is any obstruction or denial by the petitioner, respondent No.2 may approach this court for suitable direction.

A copy of the order be given dasti.

January 28, 2015
prem

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE