

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

FAO No.M-85-M of 2005 (O&M)

Date of decision: July 29, 2016

Sanjeev Sood

..... Appellant

Versus

Radha

..... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. JEYAPPAUL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SNEH PRASHAR**

Present:- Mr. Vishal Aggarwal, Advocate
for the appellant.

Mr. Sanjeev Pabbi, 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?

M. JEYAPPAUL, J. (ORAL)

Shakuntla Sood, (General Power of Attorney Holder of Sanjeev Sood, appellant) as well as Radha-petitioner No.2 were present. They suffered individual affidavits during second motion. Their affidavits were treated as statements in second motion. They have settled their matrimonial dispute before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. In terms of the compromise, Sanjeev Sood-petitioner No.1 has paid a sum of ₹ 10 lacs towards maintenance of the minor child. It is found that they are not in a position to live together as husband and wife and have mutually agreed that the marriage between them should be dissolved. Therefore, a decree of divorce by mutual consent dissolving their marriage is hereby passed. The

petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act is allowed. Decree sheet be prepared accordingly.

The appeal is disposed of accordingly.

(M. JEYAPPAUL)
JUDGE

(SNEH PRASHAR)
JUDGE

July 29, 2016
Dinesh Bansal

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes / No
Whether Reportable	Yes / No