

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.115

CR-54-2021

Date of decision : 14.1.2021

Mukesh Kumar

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

Sonia Bharti and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR MITTAL

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

SUDHIR MITTAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner and respondent No.1 are estranged. He has filed a petition under Section 12 and 25 of the Guardian and Wards Act, 1890 for custody of the minor son, which is pending consideration. Meanwhile, an application for interim custody was filed, which was disposed of vide order dated 3.3.2020 as respondent No.1 was willing to take the minor son for treatment to R.R. Hospital, Delhi. Subsequently, it appears that she did not take respondent No.2 for further treatment and the petitioner filed a second application for directions to the mother to bring the child to New Delhi for treatment. Vide order dated 27.11.2020, the trial Court has adjourned the same for 13.7.2021 by returning a finding that in the present Covid-19 pandemic situation, it is not feasible to direct the child to move to Delhi.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the date of hearing of the aforementioned application may be advanced to an earlier convenient date as physical hearing in the subordinate Courts has commenced. For granting the aforementioned relief, there is no necessity to serve the respondents.

Accordingly, the petition is disposed of with a direction by modifying order dated 27.11.2020 to the extent that the pending application shall be next taken up for consideration on 7.4.2021.

On receipt of certified copy of this order, the trial Court shall inform the respondents of the changed date.

(SUDHIR MITTAL)
JUDGE

14.1.2021
Ramandeep Singh
Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes / No
Yes/ No