

**214 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH  
CR No.4933 of 2016 (O&M)  
Date of decision : January 08, 2018**

**Dharamveer Singh** ..... **Petitioner**

**Versus**

**Anita** ..... **Respondent**

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH**

**Present:-** Mr. Sandeep Gahlawat, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S.K. Yadav, Advocate for the respondent.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

**KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 11.07.2016 passed by the learned District Judge, Narnaul, vide which the application filed by the respondent-wife under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 was allowed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner has withdrawn the main petition pending before the trial court. Therefore, the present petition has become infructuous.

However, it has been noticed that vide order dated 16.08.2017 passed by this Court, the petitioner was directed to bring a demand draft of Rs.10,000/- in the name of the respondent. The petitioner has not brought the said amount.

In view of the matter, the present petition is disposed of as having been rendered infructuous. However, ₹10,000/- to be paid by the petitioner, as per direction of the Court contained in the order dated 16.08.2017 can be recovered from him by way of execution by attachment of his property, if it is not paid within 30 days.

**(KULDIP SINGH)  
JUDGE**

**January 08, 2018**

sarita

Whether speaking / reasoned

No

Whether Reportable:

No