



**206 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**FAO-1416-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 03.07.2025**

**ASHOK KUMAR SIGH ... APPELLANT
VS.**

SARITA KUMARI SINGH AND ANR .. RESPONDENTS

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

Present: Mr. Sanjay Verma, Advocate,
for the appellant.

Mr. Vipul Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate,
for respondent No.1.

Mr. Kartar Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

1. Through this appeal, the appellant (husband of respondent No.1) assails the correctness of the decision of his petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 passed by the Family Court vide judgment dated 19.01.2018.

2. The appellant has sought dissolution of marriage by way of decree of divorce on the ground that respondent No.1 has illicit relations with respondent No.2, who is alleged to be adulterous.

3. From the loins of the appellant, respondent No.1 gave birth to his son Karshan @ Kishan, who has now attained the age of majority. The appellant failed to produce any documentary evidence to prove his allegations. Appellant claims that he came to know of the illicit

relations between respondent No.1 and respondent No.2 in the year 2007 from the colleague of respondent No.2, who has also not been examined. Even the name of the aforesaid colleague, who revealed this fact to the appellant, has not been disclosed to the Court. Moreover, the appellant came to know of alleged illicit relations of respondent No.1 with respondent No.2 in the year 2007 whereas the petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act was filed in the year 2014.

4. We have heard learned counsel representing the parties at length.

5. Learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridabad has after threadbare discussing the evidence come to a firm conclusion that the appellant has failed to prove his case. Though, learned counsel representing the appellant has made feeble attempt, however, he failed to convince this Court. The judgment passed by the Family Court is upon appreciation of material evidence and learned counsel representing the appellant failed to draw the attention of the Court to any misreading, non-reading or non-conciliation of evidence produced by the parties.

6. Hence, no ground is made out to interfere in the present appeal.

7. Dismissed.

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

03.07.2025
smriti

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

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