



CR-3660-2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

128

CR-3660-2026

Date of decision: 07.05.2026

NAVANSHEE

....PETITIONER

VERSUS

ABHINAV JINDAL

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present : Mr. Kunwar Rajan, Advocate for the petitioner/revisionist.

YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR, J. (ORAL)

1. This revision petition is instituted under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for setting aside the order dated 17.10.2025 passed by learned Family Court, Faridabad vide which application moved by petitioner seeking necessary directions to respondent to lead evidence and/or not to file unnecessary applications or to strike off the defence of respondent-husband, has been dismissed.
2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner/revisionist and have perused the material placed on record.
3. The relevant portion of the impugned order which has been assailed is reproduced as under:-

*“ At this stage, another application seeking necessary direction to petitioner to lead his evidence and not to file any unnecessary application else to strike off his defence has been moved on behalf of respondent. Copy supplied. This is a completely unnecessary application filed on behalf of respondent. If situation arises, this court can suo-moto pass such directions to either of the parties. **The application is hereby dismissed as unnecessary.** ”*



CR-3660-2026

4. As such, the only grievance of the revisionist is that respondent-husband should not take unnecessary adjournments and a prayer has been made to strike off his defence as he has not led any evidence. Learned family Court has rejected the prayer with the observation that the application in hand has been unnecessarily moved and if situation arises, the Court can suo moto pass such an order. No infirmity or illegality thus has been committed by the learned Family Court while passing the aforesaid order. Even otherwise, the defence of respondent-husband cannot be struck off merely because he has not led any evidence. No interference in the impugned order is thus called for.

5. However, perusal of record further shows that respondent-husband has time and again moved numerous applications which have been disposed of by the learned Family Court which shows that he is only interested in delaying the proceedings. Accordingly, learned Family Court is directed to decide the petition relating to the custody of the child as expeditiously as possible and no unnecessary adjournments be granted.

6. Disposed of accordingly.

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

07.05.2026

Vishal Vardhan

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No