

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

CRR No. 1235 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of decision: 10.11.2020.

Vipin Parkash

..... Petitioner.

Versus

Dr. Nisha

..... Respondent.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. J.P. Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 20.08.2020 passed by the trial Court and the order dated 15.10.2020 passed by the Appellate Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner-husband contends that by the impugned orders, the house of the petitioner-husband has been ordered to be sealed, which has caused grave prejudice to him. He further contends that there was no prayer for sealing of the house and the Courts below have erred in directing the sealing of the house.

Heard.

The respondent-wife is stated to have filed a complaint against the petitioner-husband under Sections 12, 18, 19 and 22 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. They are stated to have married on 19.02.2017, but there is no issue out of this marriage. The respondent-

wife, who is an MBBS doctor, has levelled allegations against the petitioner-husband with regard to dowry, maltreatment, beatings, domestic violence, etc. FIR No. 227 dated 13.07.2020, under Sections 323, 498-A, 406 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, was also registered against the petitioner-husband at Police Station IMT Rohtak. The respondent-wife had preferred an application before the trial Court wherein it was stated that her household articles are lying in the rented accommodation bearing House No. 900, Sector 1, Rohtak, where she resided with her husband and the petitioner-husband is in the process of disposing of those articles. It has also been noticed by the trial Court that neither the petitioner-husband nor the respondent-wife is residing in the house which was evident from the report of the District Protection Officer, Rohtak. In these circumstances, the trial Court has directed that the rented accommodation of the petitioner-husband and respondent-wife be sealed to restrain the petitioner-husband from disposing of the articles lying there. Therefore, I do not find any manifest illegality in the orders passed by the Courts below which would warrant interference by this Court while exercising revisional jurisdiction.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

10.11.2020
Ramesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No