

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CR No.7920 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision:29.8.2017**

Rupinder Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

Nari Niketan Trust Jalandhar

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr.Karminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the order dated 26.2.2014 passed by the learned court below, whereby petitioners were directed to deposit the amount of Rs.5 lacs with the respondent-Trust, which shall be deposited in the form of FDR in the name of the child, after a period of five years, till the child attains majority and also to furnish indemnity bonds to the tune of Rs.20 lacs with one surety in the like amount, petitioners have approached this Court by way of instant civil revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for setting aside the impugned order.

Notice of motion was issued. Despite service, nobody has put appearance on behalf of the respondent.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners.

When learned counsel for the petitioners was confronted with the impugned order and to point out as to what kind of prejudice was caused to the petitioners by passing the impugned order, he had no answer and rightly so, it being a matter of record. Admittedly, the impugned order passed by the learned court below is only in the interest of the child, who was adopted by the petitioners. In this view of the matter, the impugned

order would certainly cause no prejudice to the interest of the petitioners. Further, the impugned order shall be only in the form of interim arrangement, which shall come to an end the moment the child attains majority. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the learned court below was well within its jurisdiction to pass the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners could not point out any patent illegality or perversity in the impugned order, which may warrant interference, at the hands of this Court, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. The impugned order is supported by sound reasons, because of which no fault can be found with it and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that the instant civil revision petition is wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

Resultantly, with the above-said observations made, the present civil revision petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

29.8.2017
mks

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No