



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

128

CR-1383-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 06.03.2025

Alam Singh

...Petitioner

V/s

Noor Amrit Kaur

...Respondent

**CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL**

Present: Mr. Vivek Suri, Advocate, for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J (ORAL)**

The present revision petition has been preferred under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for the issuance of directions to the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridkot to expedite the hearing in the petition preferred by the petitioner under Section 13(i)(i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short the "HMA") for dissolution of marriage.

2. The case of the petitioner is that he instituted a petition under Section 13(i)(i-a) of the HMA for dissolution of marriage solemnized by the petitioner with the respondent. The petition was initially filed at Panchkula in the year 2021 but on a transfer petition having been filed by the respondent, the petition was transferred to Faridkot and was taken up by the Family Court at Faridkot for the first time on 23.01.2023. The case of the petitioner is that till today, the matter is pending for evidence of the petitioner and that despite more than four years having gone by, there does not seem to be any possibility of the petition being decided in the near future. It is the case of the petitioner that parties to the *lis* are still young and they need to take decision as regards their future also. It is, therefore, the case of the petitioner that directions be issued to the Court concerned to decide the petition in a time bound manner.



3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
4. Mr. Vivek Suri, learned counsel representing the petitioner has strenuously urged that the matter is being unnecessarily delayed. He has referred to the interlocutory orders which have been placed on record as Annexures P-4 to P-32 and has submitted that the matter has not made any tangible progress. He submits that under the circumstances, directions be issued to the Court concerned to expedite the trial and dispose of the petition in a time bound manner.
5. I have considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioner.
6. There would be no necessity of issuing notice to the respondent, for in view of the nature of the order that is proposed to be passed, no prejudice would be caused to her.
7. No doubt, the petition was filed in the year 2021 at Panchkula, whereafter, on an application for transfer having been moved by the respondent, the same was transferred to Faridkot and was taken up by the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridkot for the first time on 23.01.2023, which is evident from the interlocutory order (Annexure P-4). The respondent put in appearance on 01.03.2023, after which the matter remained pending for pleadings till 30.08.2023 (Annexure P-10), when issues were framed. Thereafter, the matter remained pending for decision on an application filed under Order 6 Rule 17 CPC and Section 24 of the HMA. The matter was also being listed for evidence of the petitioner.
8. In between, the matter was referred for mediation on 15.05.2024 and report was received on 03.09.2024 that the matter had not been resolved amicably. The matter then again remained pending for decision on the application under Section 24 of the HMA, which was finally allowed on



09.01.2025. On 05.02.2025, three witnesses of the petitioner were present and their examination-in-chief was recorded and the matter was adjourned to 02.04.2025 for their cross-examination.

9. A perusal of the interlocutory orders shows that the matter is at a preliminary stage despite four years having gone by. However, no fault can be attributed to either side because there appears to be no deliberate attempt by any side to delay the matter. At the same time, the fact that cannot be lost sight of is that four years have already gone by and the petition is still at the preliminary stage. Under the circumstances, keeping in view the facts and circumstances, as have been noticed above, I do not deem it appropriate to issue any direction for time bound disposal of the petition. Issuance of such directions would be little unfair as the Courts are already flooded with a huge number of cases.

10. The present revision petition is, therefore, disposed of with a request to the Court concerned i.e. the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridkot, where the petition under reference is pending, to expedite the proceedings and make efforts for an early disposal of the same. Any attempt by any side to delay the decision of the petition be dealt with sternly.

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

**(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)**  
**JUDGE**

**March 06, 2025**

vchgarg

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No