

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

PARAMJIT KAUR SAINI
2016.01.21 16:26
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

Civil Revision 1403 of 2015
Date of Decision: 18.1.2016

Amit Gaiind

---Petitioner

versus

Pratishtha

---Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr.Puneet Kumar Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioner

Mr. Sandeep Khunger, Advocate
for the respondent

1. Whether Reporters of local papers 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?

Rekha Mittal, J.

The present petition has been directed against the order dated 19.02.2015 passed by the Additional District Judge, Ferozepur in the petition filed by the respondent- wife seeking dissolution of marriage of the parties under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (in Short “the Act”).

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the respondent examined in part four witnesses on 04.02.2015 and their cross-examination was deferred for 19.02.2015. On 19.02.2015, counsel for the petitioner before the court below filed an application for adjournment of the case that came to be dismissed and the cross-examination of the witnesses examined by the respondent namely Pratishtha, Suresh Kumar and Ramesh Kumari

has been treated as nil. It is further argued that a serious prejudice is likely to be caused to the petitioner in case he is not permitted to cross-examine these witnesses.

Counsel for the parties are ad idem that the petitioner may be allowed one opportunity to cross-examine the aforesaid witnesses. However, counsel for the respondent has submitted that the petitioner may be directed to pay compensatory costs for his failure to cross-examine these witnesses on two occasions. Counsel for the petitioner has got no objection for the same.

In view of the above, the petition stands disposed of with a direction that the petitioner shall be entitled to one opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses namely Pratishtha, Suresh Kumar and the Ramesh Kumari subject to payment of costs of Rs. 10,000/- to the respondent and clearing up-to-date arrears of maintenance.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

18.1.2016
PARAMJIT