

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

C.R. No.2052 of 2016

Date of Decision.18.03.2016

Harish Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Smt. Sunita Rani

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Anil Kumar Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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. There is no need for intervention of consideration of application for interim maintenance determined in pendency of proceedings. It appears that the matrimonial proceeding itself has been disposed of and there is nothing pending now. The order of maintenance is self-limiting in character and the correctness need not be considered in revision petition.

2. The counsel says that if notice is issued, there can be a talk of settlement. The settlement can be worked out even outside the Court and it is unnecessary to retain this case only for consideration of whether there is going to be a settlement or not.

3. The revision petition is dismissed.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

March 18, 2016
Pankaj*