



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

(257)

CR No. 2518 of 2020 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 06.03.2025

Janak Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Gayatri Devi

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present: Mr. R.K.Arya, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Dheeraj Mahajan, Advocate
for the respondent.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)

The present revision petition is directed against the order dated 19.01.2020 passed by the Court of learned Civil Judge (Sr. Division), Gurdaspur, vide which the application moved by the respondent/applicant (Gayatri Devi) under Section 25 of the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956, was allowed and the petitioner/non-applicant was directed to pay maintenance to the respondent/applicant at the rate of ₹8000/- per month w.e.f., the date of the application i.e., 20.09.2016 for her entire lifetime.

2. Notice of motion was issued on 25.03.2021 on a contention having been raised by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was ready to amicably settle the matter with the respondent. The following order was passed by the Coordinate Bench.

***“Contends that petitioner is ready to settle the matter
with the respondent on some amicable terms.***

Notice of motion for 20.07.2021.

Notice regarding stay as well.

Till the next date of hearing, no coercive action be taken on the basis of impugned order dated 19.02.2020.”

3. Thereafter, on 30.05.2023, the petitioner was directed to bring a demand draft of ₹2,00,000/- towards maintenance payable to the respondent on the next date of hearing which was fixed as 17.07.2023:-

“The petitioner in the present case is above 60 years of age and so is the respondent. The matrimonial litigation has been going on since the year 1998. Let both the parties be present in Court on the next date of hearing.

List on 17.07.2023.

Meanwhile, the petitioner shall bring a demand draft of Rs.2,00,000/- towards maintenance on the next date of hearing.”

4. The matter could not, thereafter, be taken up for hearing.

5. On a specific query having been put by the Court, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no such demand draft has been prepared by the petitioner. As to why such demand draft has not been prepared by the petitioner is not forth-coming, for, learned counsel has no explanation to offer.

6. That being so, there is no reason for the Court to carry on with the petition, once the orders passed by the Court have not been complied.

Dismissed.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE

March 06, 2025
Rekha

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