

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

C.R. No.4176 of 2016

Date of Decision.08.07.2016

Ajay Tarneja

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Deepshikha Tarneja

.....Respondent

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

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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?

-:-

AMIT RAWAL J. (ORAL)

The petitioner-husband is aggrieved of the impugned order whereby his defence has been struck off for non-payment of the travelling expenses as indicated in the order dated 06.04.2016 as well as the impugned order.

Mr. Saini, counsel for the petitioner, while arguing with vehemence, strenuously challenged the impugned order by giving his story which is not found to be plausible regarding the steps being taken to move to England by leaving the parents into an old age home. Confronted with a question of whether any effort made for applying for visa, the answer is in negative. At this stage, Mr. Saini has made a statement that the petitioner is ready to pay travelling expenses if he is given opportunity to cross-examine.

The impugned order is set aside subject to payment of

travelling expenses on the date fixed before the Court below and thereafter,

the trial Court shall fix a date for cross-examine subject to the convenience of the respondent for visiting India. In case, the travelling expenses are not paid as directed, the order already passed by the court below shall be deemed appropriate.

The civil review is disposed of with the above direction.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

July 08, 2016
Pankaj*