
(2012) 09 P&H CK 0026
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : C.R. No. 5114 of 2009 (O and M)

Amit Hooda

APPELLANT

Vs

Smt. Manju

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 14-09-2012

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2012) 09 P&H CK 0026

Hon'ble Judges : Ajay Tewari, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Ravinder Malik, for the Appellant; Arvind Singh, for the Respondent

Judgement

Ajay Tewari, J.—This petition has been filed against the order of the Matrimonial Court granting maintenance of Rs. 5,000/- for the minor son of the parties. Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is bearing the expenses of the education of the daughter at a premium school at Nainital and even the minor son is now studying in Saint Joseph School, Nainital which fact has also been accepted by counsel for the respondent. He has further stated that the petitioner has objection in handing over money to the respondent but would have no objection in bearing the educational expenses of the child in the said school with effect from today.

2. In view of the above statement, counsel for the respondent states that the respondent would give up the claim for the maintenance from the date of the application till today.

3. Accordingly, the petitioner will make a fixed deposit of the amount of maintenance which has accrued till today in the name of the minor son and the interest thereon would be used towards the educational expenses of the said child and the shortfall would be made up by the petitioner.

4. Another prayer made by counsel for the petitioner is regarding visitation rights of the petitioner. Counsel for the respondent has stated that any order passed on this prayer would be beyond the scope of the present litigation. This Court hopes

that in view of the statement made by counsel for the petitioner, the respondent-wife would take a charitable view because whatever may be the differences between the parties to the marriage, the children should not be deprived of the company, care and love and affection of either of the parents and there is nothing unreasonable in the prayer of the petitioner for being permitted to spend some time with his child during vacations. Any way, in view of the objection of counsel for the respondent, this Court desists from passing any order on this plea. Disposed of in the above terms.