

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

(1) Crl. Revision 1095 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 27.2.2020

Anju

...Petitioner

Versus

Mandeep Singh

...Respondent

(2) Crl. Revision 1096 of 2015 (O&M)

Anju

...Petitioner

Versus

Mandeep Singh

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- Mr. Abhinav Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. NPS Kohli, Advocate,
for the respondent.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The above titled both the revisions have been filed seeking to assail the order dated 20.2.20215 passed by the Session Judge, Yamuna Nagar at Jagadhari.

In brief, the facts are that petitioner and the respondent got married on 14.2.2012. However, due to temperamental differences between the husband and wife, matrimonial dispute arose between them. Therefore, the petitioner—wife initiated proceedings under Section 23 of the Protection

of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 claiming suitable accommodation and maintenance for herself and the minor daughter. The Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Yamuna Nagar at Janadhari by order dated 12.3.2014 directed the respondent—husband to pay maintenance allowance at the rate of ₹7500/- and ₹2500/- per month to the minor daughter and wife respectively.

Aggrieved against the order of the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Yamuna Nagar, both the husband as well as the wife filed appeals before the Session Judge, who, while allowing the appeal filed by the husband—respondent herein set aside the order dated 12.3.2014 in all respects and also dismissed the appeal filed by the wife—petitioner herein for enhancement of maintenance, giving rise to the above mentioned two revisions filed by the petitioner—wife.

Learned counsel for the respondent at the outset submits that both these revisions have been rendered infructuous as the Additional Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar has finally increased the maintenance and the respondent herein has been directed to pay ₹13,000/- per month to the petitioner—wife and the minor daughter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not aware of the above development and submits that in case the statement is not found to be correct then he may be allowed to move this court for revival of these revision petitions.

In view of the statement made by the learned counsel for the respondent—husband, these revisions are disposed of having been rendered infructuous. Needless to say that in case the aforesaid statement of the

respondent is found to be incorrect, the petitioner is at liberty to file an application for revival of the revision petitions.

27.2.2020
prem

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No