

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Revision No. 2573-2019(O&M)

Date of decision: 30.04.2019

Kajal Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

Sonu Singh

.....Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Aditya Jain, Advocate for the petitioner

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 6.3.2019 passed by the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridabad, vide which, evidence of the respondent (petitioner herein) was closed by order.

Heard.

Perusal of the impugned order shows that adjournment was granted subject to costs of Rs.500/-, payable to the petitioner. Earlier, ex-parte proceedings against the respondent were set aside subject to costs. On 6.3.2019, neither costs for setting aside ex-parte proceedings were paid nor costs for adjournment were paid. It was second last opportunity. An application was filed for adjournment which was dismissed and evidence was closed by order.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that there was an

application for adjournment on the ground of marriage of relations. Copy of the application shows that adjournment was sought on the ground of marriage in the family. However, it was not mentioned in the application, as to what is the relations of the respondent with the said person and what is date of marriage and as to whether marriage is to be performed in day time or night time? So it was vague application for adjournment. The costs were not paid, as observed above. Therefore, there is no illegality or infirmity in the order of the trial Court

Resultantly, the present petition stands dismissed.

30.04.2019*gk***(Kuldip Singh)
Judge**

Whether speaking/ reasoned:

Yes

Whether Reportable:

No