



\$~54

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.M.C. 6083/2024 & CRL.M.A. 23326/2024**

BHAVJOT SINGH CHANDHOKPetitioner

Through: Dr. S.S. Hooda, Mr. Aayushman
Aeron & Mr. Ashutosh Kumar,
Advocates

versus

AMANDEEP KAUR CHANDHOK & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Anirudh Mudgal &
Ms. Somyashree, Advocates (thru
VC)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

% **07.08.2024**

CRL.M.A. 23325/2024

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of accordingly.

CRL.M.C. 6083/2024

1. This petition is filed assailing the impugned judgment / order dated 16th July 2024 passed by the ASJ in Crl. Appeal No.225/2023 preferred by the respondent-wife under Section 29 of the DV Act. The appeal was against order dated 9th June 2023 passed by the Metropolitan Magistrate in MC No. 263/2022.
2. Respondent had instituted petition under Domestic Violence Act, 2005 alleging various incidents of continued domestic violence upon her, including physical assault, mental abuse and economic violence. The Metropolitan Magistrate, while passing the order in relation to various relief sought by the



respondent, disallowed her request for having keys to her bedroom door and to put her own lock on the bedroom door. This was in context that the property was subject matter of the suit before this Court and there was an order of *status quo*.

3. These aspects have been suitably addressed in the impugned order and it is rightly stated by the ASJ that none of the parties are disputing possession of petitioner-husband in respect of bedroom in which respondent-wife is residing along with her minor daughter for the past 15 years. The issue was only limited for permission to respondent to put locks on her door so that she can have access. Considering possession of respondent-wife was admitted to be prior to *status quo* order, putting a lock on the door in order for access and privacy, could not in any manner construe as giving right to respondent-wife to the suit property; which would always be subject to orders of this Court in the suit pending before it being CS (OS) No. 2173/2015.

4. This Court does not find any infirmity in the said order, particularly in context of averments and serious allegations made by respondent-wife in her petition before the Metropolitan Magistrate.

5. The petition is dismissed.

6. Pending applications, if any, are rendered infructuous.

7. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

AUGUST 7, 2024/sm