



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

286

CR No.6468 of 2024 (O&M)

Date of Decision :21.07.2025

Sandeep Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

Kewal Singh

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE VIKRAM AGGARWAL

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. I.S.Brar, Advocate for the respondent.

VIKRAM AGGARWAL, J. (Oral):

1. On 07.11.2024, the following order was passed:-

“The present petition has been filed, inter alia, challenging the order dated 19.03.2024 (Annexure P-8) vide which defence of the petitioner was struck off on the ground that the petitioner failed to file her response to the application under Order 9 Rule 13 of CPC filed by the respondent-husband despite availing numerous opportunities. However, the matter is pending for 28.11.2024 before the Family Court at the stage of cross examination of evidence of the applicant-respondent/husband.

It is a strange case where the petitioner had filed a petition seeking divorce, which was initially contested by the respondent-husband. However, the respondent-husband stopped appearing in the same, and the case was proceeded ex parte. Consequently, a decree of divorce was granted on 06.01.2022 (Annexure P-2). The respondent-husband filed an application under Order 9 Rule 13 of CPC on 09.02.2023 (Annexure P-4) for setting aside the ex parte



decree, that to after more than one year, in which notice was issued. Although the petitioner appeared through her counsel on 25.05.2023 (Annexure P-5) but she did not file any reply to the said application.

Amidst all the above controversies, it has been brought to the Court's notice that after the grant of the decree of divorce on 06.01.2022, the present petitioner got married to one Bobbin Kumar on 26.03.2024, i.e., after the filing of the above said application by the respondent-husband. Apparently, it is a complex case where matrimonial ties were already severed and the same was affirmed by way of Court decree. Nevertheless, counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent be called to explore the possibility of an amicable solution.

In light of the above, let notice be issued to the respondent for 14.11.2024 only on the said aspect as of now.

The petitioner and the respondent are directed to be present in Court on the next date of hearing.

Counsel for the petitioner is also directed to serve the petitioner dasti as well as through the counsel before the trial Court.”

2. On 17.03.2025, parties were not present, as a result of which, the matter was adjourned to 20.05.2025 and a direction was issued to the parties to remain present in the Court.

3. On 20.05.2025, the following order was passed:-

“Mr. Inderjeet Singh Brar, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of the respondent and has filed his memorandum of appearance. He undertakes to file the power of attorney on or before the next date of hearing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he could not contact the petitioner as a result of which the



order dated 17.03.2025 could not be conveyed to her. It is urged that the petitioner shall be present in Court on the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 21.07.2025.

The parties shall remain present in Court on the next date of hearing.”

4. Today, no one has appeared on behalf of the petitioner nor the parties are present. It appears that the petitioner is no longer interested in pursuing the present revision petition.

5. Dismissed for non-prosecution.

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

**(VIKRAM AGGARWAL)
JUDGE**

21.07.2025

Manoj Bhutani

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No
Whether reportable Yes/No