

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 6140 of 2015

Date of decision : May 16, 2016

Sanjeev Gupta

..... Petitioner

Versus

Aarti

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Ashish Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate
for the respondent.

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 passed in the application under Section 24 in a petition filed under Section 12 of the Hindu Marriage Act at the instance of the wife granting maintenance pendente lite and litigation expenses to the tune of ₹5,000/- each.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent-wife submits that the petition under Section 12 of the Act in HMA Case No. 1154 of 16.10.2014 has been decided on 12.10.2015.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties, appraised the paper book and of the view that petitioner (herein) respondent in the trial court had been appearing but thereafter in order to avoid liability of paying the maintenance pendente lite

stopped appearing. I am of the view that once the marriage has been declared null and void, no cause of action survives in the present revision petition.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order and the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

The revision petition is devoid of merits.
Accordingly the same is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 16 , 2016
archana