

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 1044 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: February 11,2016

Thakar Singh

.....Petitioner

VS.

Preeto and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.KANNAN

Present: Mr. P.S.Jammu, 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?**

K.KANNAN,J (Oral)

1. The revision is against the order allowing the respondent to sue as an indigent person. It is a suit for maintenance and the court fee requirement is that the valuation must be made for the claim for 10 years. It is too stiff a burden that a person can shoulder that the court has allowed at prosecute as an indigent person, it would not require any interference.

2. The Revision petition is dismissed.

FEBRUARY 11, 2016

Rajeev

**(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE**