



121 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

FAO-4165-2025 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.07.2025

MUKESH RANI ... APPELLANT
VS.
SURYA KANT .. RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR

Present: Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate, for the appellant.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

1. An application filed by the respondent under Section 6 of the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, 1956 (read with Section 25 of the Guardians and Wards Act, 1890) has been partly allowed with the following observations:-

“As a sequel to above discussions, the present application is hereby partly allowed and partly dismissed. The prayer of petitioner seeking tempoary custody of the minor child stands declined, however, his prayer of meeting with minor child stands allowed and he is allowed to meet the minor child either on each and every date of hearing of instant petition or as and when directed by the Court from time to time if due to certain urgency the child could not be produced in the Court on date fixed for meeting.”

2. Learned counsel representing the appellant (wife) submits that it is not convenient for the child to come with the mother on each and every date of hearing as it would hamper his study. He further submits that the Court should have made alternative arrangements.

3. This Court has considered the submissions made by learned counsel representing the appellant and in our opinion, the appellant will be well advised to file an application before the Family Court for making suitable amendment to ensure that the study of the child does not suffer.

4. With the aforesaid observations, the appeal is disposed of.

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

09.07.2025
smriti

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No