

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.991 of 2016
Date of decision:10.02.2016

Parwinder Kaur @ Prem Kaur ... Petitioner

Vs.

Surinder Singh and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Ms. Sunita Punia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

The petitioner-wife is aggrieved of the order dated 21.11.2015 (Annexure P-5), whereby, an application filed at the instance of the respondent, to get the specimen writing of respondent No.1 in Punjabi script, has been allowed.

Ms. Sunita Punia, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per the provisions of Section 20(3) of the Constitution of India, no person can be forced to be a witness against the person who has sought the divorce on the ground of adultery and cruelty. The letters alleged to have been relied upon have specifically been denied. The aforementioned provisions of law is squarely applicable to the facts and circumstances of the present case, thus, order under challenge is not sustainable in the eyes of law.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and am of the view that there is no substance in the aforementioned submissions for the reasons that respondent has relied upon certain letters. The contents of the letters are in vernacular. Even the 'Vakalatnama' and affidavit have been signed in vernacular. However, in order to compare the signatures of such letters stated to be written in vernacular, the disputed contents of the letters cannot be compared with the admitted signatures on written statement and for that purpose petitioner is required to write 05-10 lines in vernacular only then comparison can be done by an expert.

In view of the aforementioned observations, there is no illegality and perversity in the findings rendered in the impugned order, much less, the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

Accordingly, the revision petition is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

February 10, 2016
savita