

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No.7367 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of Order:30.10.2018

Sanjeev Kapoor

..Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Chandana Kapoor

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. A.K.Jain, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

By an impugned order, the learned trial court has only summoned an official from the bank with details of bank account in which her husband is a joint account holder.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that this account is a joint account maintained by the husband along with his brother, which is a Non Resident Indian (NRI) and is remitting the amount in the aforesaid account so as to facilitate withdrawal in India. Hence, he submitted that the official from the bank with the details of the accounts could not be summoned in view of Section 136 of the Indian Evidence Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner insist that the court was required to examine the admissibility and relevance of evidence at the time of summoning.

In the considered view of this court this aspect has already been considered by the trial court. Once, the husband is a joint account holder the wife in order to prove the income of her husband can be permitted to

summon an official from the bank.

In view thereof, this court does not find any good ground to interfere with the impugned order.

The revision petition is dismissed.

October 30, 2018
nt

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No