

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.1476 of 2016

Date of Decision.01.03.2016

Amita Garg

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Sh. Atul Garg and others

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. A.K. Khunger, Advocate for
Mr. R.K. Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Anju Arora, Advocate
for respondent No.1.

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?

-. -

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. A persistent claim for injunction is meaningless when very same subject matter was brought before this Court in C.R. No.1325 of 2016 on 23.02.2016 and I have declined the relief of injunction. The additional point which is now canvassed is that the petitioner had been married to respondent No.1 even in the year 2009 which is against the marriage certificate which is filed before the court that shows that the marriage took place only in the year 2011 at Arya Samaj Mandir, Sector 15, Faridabad.

2. There is simply no merit in the revision petition. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 01, 2016
Pankaj*