

FAO No.M-175 of 2017 (O & M)
FAO No.2102 of 2017 (O & M)
FAO No.7364 of 2017 (O & M)

-1-

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

FAO No.M-175 of 2017 (O & M)
Date of Decision: 17.10.2018

Manmeet Singh

.....Appellant

Vs.

Gurpreet Kaur

..... Respondent

FAO No.2102 of 2017 (O & M)

Gurpreet Kaur and another

.....Appellants

Vs.

Manmeet Singh

..... Respondent

FAO No.7364 of 2017 (O & M)

Manmeet Singh and another

.....Appellants

Vs.

Gurpreet Kaur

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN
HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: - Mr. G.S. Toor, Advocate for the appellant(s) in
FAO-M-175-2017 & FAO-7364-2017 and
for the respondent(s) in FAO-2102-2017

Ms. Neha Jain, Advocate for the respondent (s) in
FAO-M-175-2017 & FAO-7364-2017 and
for the appellant (s) in FAO-2102-2017

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J. (ORAL)

This order shall dispose of three petitions bearing FAO-M-175-
2017 (first appeal), FAO-2102-2017 (second appeal) and FAO-7364-2017
(third appeal).

FAO No.M-175 of 2017 (O & M)
FAO No.2102 of 2017 (O & M)
FAO No.7364 of 2017 (O & M)

-2-

The first appeal has been filed by the husband against the order dated 27.02.2017 passed by the Civil Judge (Senior Division), Patiala by which application under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short “the Act”) seeking restitution of conjugal rights, has been dismissed.

The second appeal has been filed by the wife against the order dated 27.02.2017 passed by the Civil Judge (Senior Division), Patiala on petition filed under Section 25 of the Guradian and Wards Act, 1890 (for short “1890 Act”) by which the respondent-husband has been given visitation rights.

The third appeal has been filed by the husband against the order dated 27.02.2017 passed by the Civil Judge (Senior Division), Patiala whereby the petition under Section 25 of the 1890 Act seeking custody of the minor daughter has been dismissed.

Both the learned counsel for the parties submit that the matter has been compromised between the parties on 28.09.2018.

In view of the said fact, both the counsel for the parties have prayed that their respective appeals may be dismissed as not pressed but with a rider that both the parties would abide by the terms and conditions of the compromise effected between the parties on 28.09.2018.

We order accordingly.

(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

17.10.2018
A.Kaundal

Whether speaking /reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No