

2025:PHHC:056138



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

283

CR-1407-2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 30.04.2025

MANJIT SINGH

... Petitioner

VERSUS

MANDEEP KAUR

... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Petitioner in person with his counsel
Mr. A.S. Khosa, Advocate.

Respondent and minor child in person with their counsel
Ms. Shubreet Kaur, Advocate.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. The present revision petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India by the petitioner-father challenging the order dated 07.02.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court Dhuri on the ground that visitation rights were not sufficient.

2. Vide order dated 05.03.2024 notice of motion was issued. On 21.03.2024 learned counsel for the respondent-mother had put in appearance and had filed her vakalatnama. The parties were directed to remain present in Court on the next date of hearing i.e. 16.04.2024. On 16.04.2024 the petitioner-father was made to interact with the child from 10:00 am to 2:00 pm in the Court premises in the Counselling Room. Thereafter the parties were *ad idem* that there may be a chance of an amicable settlement and that

the matter may be referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. They were directed to appear before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court on 22.04.2024 and the case was adjourned to 03.05.2024 to await the report of the Mediator. Mediation failed as noticed in the order dated 03.05.2024. Parties were once again directed to remain present in Court on the next date of hearing i.e. 10.05.2024. Thereafter, an agreed order was passed permitting the petitioner-father to meet the child once a week on every Saturday between 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm to gauge the comfort level of the child. Since an unpleasant situation was created at the time of meeting, the Court, after interacting with the child, sent the child to the Counsellor's room where the Counsellor also interacted with the child. Thereafter the parties were once again agreeable that the child be taken to MGM Cinema, Dhuri between 5:00 pm to 7:00 pm on every Saturday so that the petitioner-father can interact with the child. The said arrangement continued. On 30.08.2024 learned counsel for the petitioner-father, on instructions from the petitioner-father, stated that the petitioner-father was willing to take the respondent-mother with him. It was noticed in the order dated 30.08.2024 that the petitioner-father was changing his stand and despite several attempts to enable the petitioner-father to interact with the child so that the child could open up to the petitioner-father, the same have all gone in vain.

3. Thereafter on 28.03.2025 the following order was passed by this Court :

'Learned counsel for the respondent states that the petitioner has made a categorical statement that he is willing to reconcile all his differences with the respondent and undertakes to keep the mother and child in the matrimonial home happily.

To explore the possibility of a compromise, let the parties remain present in Court once again.

List on 30.04.2025.

On the next date of hearing, the petitioner shall bring a demand draft amounting to ₹30,000/- in the name of the respondent towards litigation expenses.

4. Today learned counsel for the petitioner-father, on instructions from the petitioner-father who is present in person, states that the petitioner-father does not wish to press the present petition as he cannot pay the litigation expenses of ₹30,000 (rupees thirty thousand) to the respondent-mother and seeks permission to withdraw the present revision petition.

5. Dismissed as withdrawn. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

30.04.2025

Aman Jain

(ALKA SARIN)

JUDGE

*NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: Yes/No*