

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CR-9092-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision : 11.01.2018

Arjun Yash Mahajan

..... Petitioner

Versus

Shivani Mahajan

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Akshay Bhan, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Abhilaksh Grover, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arjun Sheoran, Advocate for the caveator/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)

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 19.12.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by learned Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division), Panchkula vide which the custody of the child of the parties namely *Inayat Mahajan* was ordered to be delivered to respondent for 11 days commencing from 21.12.2017 to 01.01.2018. It comes out that in fact the date has already passed and the custody of the child has been delivered back.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has apprehension that in future also, on the same analogy, application may be filed and similar order might be passed. Therefore, it is directed that the reasoning given in the application may not be taken as a precedent for deciding such future

application. If such application for custody for limited period is filed, trial Court shall decide the same independent of the view taken in the present impugned order.

In view of the said fact, the present revision petition has become infructuous.

Disposed of as having become infructuous.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

11.01.2018
preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable:	No