

\$~41

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CM(M) 846/2017

PUNAM GANDHI

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. H S Bhullar, Ms. Sarabjeet Kaur
and Ms. Bhawani Gupta, Advocates

versus

MAHESH PAL SINGH

..... Respondent

Through: Tribikram, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.R. MIDHA

ORDER

% **15.09.2017**

1. The petitioner is seeking waiver of statutory period of six months prescribed in Section 13 B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act.
2. In **Amardeep Singh vs. Harveen Kaur** Civil Appeal No. 11158/ 2017 decided on 12th September, 2017, the Supreme Court has held that the six months period under Section 13 B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act can be waived off by the Family Court. Relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced hereunder:-

*“14. The Court must be satisfied that the parties were living separately for more than the statutory period and all efforts at mediation and reconciliation have been tried and have failed and there is no chance of reconciliation and further waiting period will only prolong their agony.
15. We have given due consideration to the issue involved. Under the traditional Hindu Law, as it stood prior to the statutory law on the point, marriage is a sacrament and cannot be dissolved by consent. The Act enabled the court to dissolve marriage on statutory grounds. By way of amendment in the year 1976, the concept of divorce by mutual consent was introduced. However, Section 13B(2) contains a bar to divorce being granted before six months of time elapsing after filing of the divorce petition by mutual consent. The said period was laid down*

to enable the parties to have a rethink so that the court grants divorce by mutual consent only if there is no chance for reconciliation.

16. The object of the provision is to enable the parties to dissolve a marriage by consent if the marriage has irretrievably broken down and to enable them to rehabilitate them as per available options. The amendment was inspired by the thought that forcible perpetuation of status of matrimony between unwilling partners did not serve any purpose. The object of the cooling off the period was to safeguard against a hurried decision if there was otherwise possibility of differences being reconciled. The object was not to perpetuate a purposeless marriage or to prolong the agony of the parties when there was no chance of reconciliation. Though every effort has to be made to save a marriage, if there are no chances of reunion and there are chances of fresh rehabilitation, the Court should not be powerless in enabling the parties to have a better option.

17. In determining the question whether provision is mandatory or directory, language alone is not always decisive. The Court has to have the regard to the context, the subject matter and the object of the provision. This principle, as formulated in Justice G.P. Singh's "Principles of Statutory Interpretation" (9th Edn., 2004), has been cited with approval in *Kailash versus Nanhku and ors.*(2005) 4 SCC 480 as follows:

"The study of numerous cases on this topic does not lead to formulation of any universal rule except this that language alone most often is not decisive, and regard must be had to the context, subject-matter and object of the statutory provision in question, in determining whether the same is mandatory or directory. In an oft-quoted passage Lord Campbell said: 'No universal rule can be laid down as to whether mandatory enactments shall be considered directory only or obligatory with an implied nullification for disobedience. It is the duty of courts of justice to try to get at the real intention of the legislature by carefully attending to the whole scope of the statute to be considered.'

" 'For ascertaining the real intention of the legislature', points out Subbarao, J. 'the court may consider inter alia, the nature and design of the statute, and the consequences which would follow from construing it the one way or the other; the impact of other provisions whereby the necessity of complying with the provisions in question is avoided; the circumstances, namely, that the statute provides for a contingency of the non-compliance with the provisions; the fact that the non-compliance with the provisions is or is not visited by some penalty; the serious or the trivial consequences, that flow therefrom; and above all, whether the object of the legislation will be defeated or furthered'. If object of the enactment will be defeated by holding the same directory, it will be construed as mandatory, whereas if by holding it mandatory serious

general inconvenience will be created to innocent persons without very much furthering the object of enactment, the same will be construed as directory.”

18. Applying the above to the present situation, we are of the view that where the Court dealing with a matter is satisfied that a case is made out to waive the statutory period under Section 13B(2), it can do so after considering the following :

i) the statutory period of six months specified in Section 13B(2), in addition to the statutory period of one year under Section 13B(1) of separation of parties is already over before the first motion itself;

ii) all efforts for mediation/conciliation including efforts in terms of Order XXXIIA Rule 3 CPC/Section 23(2) of the Act/Section 9 of the Family Courts Act to reunite the parties have failed and there is no likelihood of success in that direction by any further efforts;

iii) the parties have genuinely settled their differences including alimony, custody of child or any other pending issues between the parties;

iv) the waiting period will only prolong their agony.

19. The waiver application can be filed one week after the first motion giving reasons for the prayer for waiver.

20. If the above conditions are satisfied, the waiver of the waiting period for the second motion will be in the discretion of the concerned Court.

21. Since we are of the view that the period mentioned in Section 13B(2) is not mandatory but directory, it will be open to the Court to exercise its discretion in the facts and circumstances of each case where there is no possibility of parties resuming cohabitation and there are chances of alternative rehabilitation.”

3. This petition is disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to approach the Family Court for waiver of the statutory period under Section 13 B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act in view of **Amardeep Singh vs. Harveen Kaur** (supra).

4. Copy of this order be given *dasti* to the learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. Copy of this order be sent to the respondent.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2017
sm

J.R. MIDHA, J.