

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 1681-2020

Date of Decision: 12.03.2020

Tejasvi Sharma

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Vikas Kalia

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Ajay Shama, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Though learned counsel for the petitioner may be correct to the extent that the respondent was actually avoiding appearance in the trial court in the petition filed by the petitioner under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, only to avoid paying maintenance, the fact of the matter remains that eventually he has appeared, and vide the impugned order *ex parte* proceedings ordered earlier against him have been recalled.

Obviously therefore, any order passed on the application under Section 24 of the said Act, filed by the petitioner, would be dealt with on its own merits, after which the respondent would have to adhere to that order.

That being so and looking at the fact that it is actually a petition filed for divorce by the present petitioner, i.e. the wife, in my opinion, while allowing no further 'leeway' to the respondent to seek any unnecessary adjournments before the trial court, there is no ground to interfere with the impugned order.

Consequently, this petition is dismissed but with the trial court

directed to ensure that any unnecessary adjournments sought by the respondent, will be dealt with very severely by that court, by either wholly refusing such requests, or by imposing very heavy costs upon him.

March 12, 2020
nitin/dinesh

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable	Yes