



A.No.2934 of 2023

in

OP.No.196 of 2020

R.N.MANJULA, J.

WEB COPY

The applicant is the respondent in the main petition and the father of the minor child. The respondent, the mother of the minor child, filed the main Original Petition seeking to appoint herself as the guardian of the minor child, namely Veslina G.R., and grant permanent custody to her.

2. The applicant has filed this application to receive certain additional documents to be produced as evidence on his side at the time of examination.

3. Heard the submissions made by either side learned counsels and perused the materials available on record.

4. The learned counsel for the applicant submitted that all these documents were not available at the time when the applicant filed his counter in the main petition. These documents are produced to show that the applicant financially contributed to the family and maintained the respondent and the minor child. The emails are sought to be filed to show



that the respondent prevented the children from having any conversation with the applicant. The rest of the documents have been filed about how the applicant cooperated with the family and hence, these documents should be permitted to be filed as additional documents on behalf of the applicant.

5. The learned counsel for the respondent submitted that these documents which are now sought to be filed by the applicant not necessary to the proceedings pending before this Court. The documents No. 15 to 20 are in no way relevant to the relief sought in the main petition and the documents No. 6 to 10 and 14 to 17 relate to some property transaction, which is totally irrelevant. Document Nos. 11 to 13 have already been produced by the respondent herself.

6. The main Original Petition has been filed by the respondent/mother seeks guardianship and custody of the minor child, namely Veslina G.R., aged 13 years. The application has been filed to receive some 20 documents that are said to be relevant to the purpose of this case. As stated already, the respondent herself has produced documents Nos. 11 to 13, and hence it is only superfluity for the



petitioner/ the applicant to produce the same document once again.

Documents Nos. 5 to 10 and 14 to 19 relate to some property transactions that are not relevant to the scope of the guardianship proceedings.

Document No. 20 is said to be in connection with the employment of the parties and this is also alien to the issue involved in the guardianship original petition. In my considered opinion, except documents Nos. 3, 4 and 5, I do not find anything relevant.

In the result, this application is **partly allowed** in respect of documents No.3, 4 and 5 alone and they are ordered to be received subject to proof and relevancy. The application is partly dismissed in respect of the other documents.

23.08.2023

jrs

Index:Yes/No



WEB COPY



R.N.MANJULA,J

jrs

A.No.2934 of 2023
in
OP.No.196 of 2020

23.08.2023