

**In the Court of Manav,
Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana.**

UID No. PB0299

(1)

CIS No. CRA-499-2023

CNR No. PBLD01-012785-2023

Date of Decision: 31.07.2026

1. Rishita @ Rishu Mahajan aged about 41 years w/o Sh. Vinay Mahajan, d/o Ramesh Sehgal.
2. Trisha Mahajan minor daughter of Sh. Vinay Mahajan, aged about 15 years, through her next friend and natural guardian Smt. Rishita @ Rishu Mahajan

Both residents of House No. B-I-980/5, Daulat Street, opposite Police Line, Civil Lines, Ludhiana

...Appellants/Aggrieved persons

Versus

1. Vinay Mahajan s/o Sh. Vijay Mahajan (Husband) ,
2. Vijay Mahajan s/o Sh. Babu Ram Mahajan (Fahter-in-law)
3. Savita Mahajan w/o Sh. Vijay Mahajan (Mother-in-law)
4. Vivek Mahajan s/o Sh. Vijay Mahajan (Brother-in-law)
5. Nisha Mahajan w/o Sh. Vivek Mahajan (Sister-in-law)

All residents of House No. B-I-980/5, Daulat Street, opposite Police Line, Civil Lines, Ludhiana.

...Respondents.

(2)

CIS No. CRA-514-2023

CNR No. PBLD01-013290-2023

Date of Decision: 31.07.2026

Vinay Mahajan, aged about 42 years s/o Sh. Vijay Mahajan r/o House No. B-I-980/5, Daulat Street, opposite Police Line, Civil Lines, Ludhiana.

...Appellant.

Versus

1. Rishita @ Rishu Mahajan w/o Vinay Mahajan, d/o Ramesh Sehgal
r/o House No. B-I-980/5, Daulat Street, opposite Police Line, Civil
Lines, Ludhiana.
2. Trisha Mahajan minor daughter of Vinay Mahajan, aged about 14
years, through Rishita @ Rishu Mahajan
Both residents of House No. B-I-980/5, Daulat Street, opposite
Police Line, Civil Lines, Ludhiana

...Respondents.

Two criminal appeals against the order dated 29.04.2023 passed by the court of Sh. Rajiv Kumar Garg, learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana, in the petition bearing CIS No.COMA/8111/2022, titled as “Rishita Vs. Vinay Mahajan and others” filed under Sections 23 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 for the grant of interim reliefs.

Present: Mr. Stevon Soni, Advocate for appellants Rishita & Anr.
Mr. Gaurav Gupta, Advocate for respondent no.1(appellant
in Appeal no.2) Vinay Mahajan
Sh.Sudesh Mahajan, Advocate for respondents no.2 & 3
Vijay Mahajan and Savita Mahajan
Sh.Sunny Aggarwal, Advocate for respondent no.4
Vivek Mahajan

JUDGMENT

1. This common judgment shall dispose of two appeals arising out of same interlocutory order dated 29.04.2023 passed under Domestic Violence Act,, 2005 (DV Act) in order to avoid repetition of discussion and conflicting orders. The first appeal is preferred by appellants Rishita and her daughter Trisha, who were granted the relief of maintenance and monthly rent for alternate accommodation but denied any relief for protection from unlawful dispossession from matrimonial house, claiming enhanced amount of maintenance, protection from unlawful dispossession and right to residence. The second appeal has been preferred by appellant

Vinay Mahajan, the husband on the ground that the maintenance granted is on higher side, with prayer for its reduction.

2. The parties are being referred as **the applicants and respondents**, same nomenclature as before the trial court, to avoid confusion.

3. Notice of both the appeals was given to the parties, which contested the appeals through their learned respective counsels. Trial court record was requisitioned and received.

Factual Background

4. The applicants moved an application under the DV Act seeking reliefs of protection order, maintenance and residence order with specific allegations that they have threat of unlawful dispossession from the respondents. Along with the main application, they moved application under Section 23 of DV Act seeking interim reliefs in same nature till disposal of the main application. The applicants pleaded that they are legally wedded wife and minor daughter of respondent No.1 and since marriage, the residence is the house No. B-I-980/5, Daulat Street, Opposite Police Lines, Civil Lines, Ludhiana (hereinafter '**matrimonial house**'). That, the marriage was solemnized on 13.12.2006 in which sufficient dowry was given to the respondents. The roka ceremony was performed on 27.04.2006 and ring ceremony on 12.12.2006. The matrimonial house is shared household of the parties and the joint family property of the respondents having purchased with the joint funds of the family. Out of wedlock, female child namely Trisha Mahajan was born on 17.05.2008 who is residing with applicant no.1 in portion of the shared household consisting of two rooms, one kitchen, lobby and bathroom on

the first floor of the house. She is in 9th standard at Sat Pal Mittal School, Dugri, Ludhiana. Respondent No.2 had projected his son/respondent No. 1 as a partner in firm M/s New Vijay Textiles, 2980, Ganesh Nagar, backside Janankpuri, Ludhiana. Later on, the respondents started demanding luxury car and gold ornaments and kept on demanding the same but her father since already spent huge amount on the marriage, was unable to meet the demands. The demands were made in the month of October, 2007 on the occasion of karva chauth and diwali. The parents of applicant No.1 handed over and entrusted customary gifts and sum of Rs.2 lacs in cash to respondents No.2 and 3. It has been alleged that respondent No. 2 used to come late in the nights under the influence of alcohol and abused the applicant in filthy language and also caused mental torture. On 27.08.2007, when she conceived, the respondents never cared for her, rather used to compel her to do the household work, due to which she had complications in her pregnancy. Respondent No.1 started abusing and beating her in the presence of all the respondents and slaps and kick blows were given even by the other respondents and respondent No. 1 broke her little finger of left hand. She narrated these facts to her parents and moved a complaint dated 14.03.2021 to the SHO, PS Divn. No. 8 but due to political pressure of the respondents, police registered a case under Section 107/151 CrPC only. Moreover, respondent No.3 mother in law moved a petition under Section 23 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 against her and respondent No.1 in the Court of Hon'ble Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana. Again in the month of August, 2021 respondent started raising

an illegal demand of dowry. On 23.08.2021, respondents tried to dispossess her from the shared household illegally and forcibly, but could not succeed in their motive. Then she filed a suit for permanent injunction titled as “Rishita Vs. Savita & Ors.” pending in the Court of Ld. Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Ludhiana. She further submitted that being a matrimonial house, petitioner No. 1 has a legal right to reside therein peacefully. Respondent No. 1 has withdrawn from the society of the petitioner since August, 2020 without any plausible reason and since then he has not given a single penny to her for maintenance. She has no movable and immovable property of her own except the istridhan/dowry articles including the jewellery and clothes and has no independent source of income to support herself and her daughter. On other side, respondent No. 2 is man of means and has a business of shawls/stoles etc. and is earning about Rs.2,00,000/- per month. Besides it, respondent No. 1 is also doing job with M/s Findoc Financial Services, Ferozepur Road, Ludhiana and drawing salary of Rs. 80,000/- per month and also maintains huge bank balance in account i.e. HDFC Bank, Feroze Gandhi Market and also having FDRs, Jiwan Kishore with profits Policy (LIC policy) and Jiwan Saral Policy. Apart from that respondent No. 1 also owns three cars. As per status and standard of parties, the applicants required Rs.1,50,000/- as maintenance including their basis necessities and Rs.1,50,000/- for litigation expenses and a right to residence in the matrimonial house with protection from unlawful dispossession.

5. Upon notice, the respondent no.1 appeared and filed reply that applicants have mentioned his wrong address as he is residing in a rented

accommodation at the first floor of House No.2025, Indrapuri, Street No.5, Near Samrala Chowk, Ludhiana at rent of Rs.8000/- per month w.e.f April, 2021 and that too on account of misdeeds of applicant no.1. Due to mental harassment by her, it is difficult to carry on the marital relationship and it is not safe for him to live with her. A divorce case is pending in another Court. The business and earnings of respondent No.1 as pleaded, were specifically denied, however, he did not plead anything regarding his actual mode of earnings and income. He prayed for dismissal of the petition.

6. The respondents no.2 to 5 filed a separate joint written reply admitting that the applicants are residing on first floor of matrimonial house and have a separate mess. They denied all the allegations of matrimonial cruelty and pleaded that the applicants are mere licensees, who were allowed to live in first floor, but have no right to reside in matrimonial house because applicant no.1 has spoiled the life of respondents. Various litigations are pending between the parties and in such scenario, if residence order is passed, it would add fuel to the fire and would spoil life of both the parties. All other averments have been denied and counter allegations have been made against the applicants and prayer for dismissal of the application was made.

7. After hearing the parties and their counsels, learned trial court partly allowed the interlocutory application, whereby the monthly income of respondent no.1 was considered as Rs.50,000/- per month, applicants were granted the interim maintenance of Rs.4000/- each per month along with Rs.8000/- for alternate rented accommodation and respondent No.1

was directed to pay Rs.10,000/- per month towards education expenses of applicant no.2. The said order has been assailed by both the parties in these appeals.

Arguments

8. Learned counsel representing the applicants submitted that impugned order is grossly perverse and illegal, having been passed without due application of judicial mind. He has argued that the applicants are residing in the house in question for the last 17 years and under the garb of passing an order of protection and maintenance in their favour, they have been ousted of the house by declining their relief of residence. That, the possession of the applicants is separate on the first floor of the house, thus, there is no interference in the use and occupation on the ground floor by the other respondents. That, the law under DV Act is to protect the woman from vagrancy and destitution, thus same cannot be used to pass an order against the interests of the victims, which in present case, are lawfully wedded wife and a minor child. Learned counsel referred to documents including bank account statements of respondent to argue that his plea of residing separate from his parents and doing a job are false pretexts to oust the applicants from the house in question. He argued that respondent no.1 is paying the electricity and insurance bills of his parents and there are other money transactions between them. He submitted written arguments and prayed for enhancement of maintenance amount and for passing a residence and protection order in favour of the applicants.

9. Learned counsel for respondents no.2 and 3, who are the parents in law of applicant no.1, argued that the house in question is owned by them and they are now in their old age. Their son, husband of applicant no.1 is no more residing with them in the house in question. That, applicant no.1 has been leveling serious allegations of cruelty, harassment and torture against them. She has also leveled allegations of behavioural misconduct on the part of her father in law. Learned counsel produced a list of cases pending between the parties. In light of these circumstances, he argued that it is not safe for the parties to reside together in the same house. That, the portion in possession of the applicants is not a separate portion, but a part of duplex house. The access to this portion is from inside the house as the stairs are on the ground floor. That, the kitchen is common for both the floors. Therefore, the use of ingress, egress and kitchen by the applicants is a constant interference in the use and occupation of ground floor of the house by respondents no.2 to 4. He further argued that the house is a self acquired property of parents and respondent no.1 has no right, title or interest therein. That, the applicants have legal rights against respondent no.1 and not against them, thus, she has no right to residence in their house. He, thus, argued that the order passed by learned trial court, granting rent of Rs.8000/- for alternate accommodation to the applicants is a lawful order, calling for no interference. Qua that part, he prayed for dismissal of appeal.

10. Learned counsel representing respondents no.4 and 5, who are the other son and daughter in law of respondents no.2 and 3, argued on similar lines to the effect that they are residing in the house with

respondents no.2 & 3 on ground floor. That, respondent no.1 is living separately and has no right, title or interest in the house. That, applicant no.1 has multifarious litigation with the respondents and her possession on the first floor is a constant interference in the peaceful use and occupation of ground floor by them and their old parents. They accordingly prayed for dismissal of appeal.

11. Learned counsel for respondent no.1 on the one hand argued against the appeal of the applicants and submitted that the order of rent of Rs.8000/- for alternate accommodation of the applicants has been rightly passed in view of the facts and circumstances of the case. He supported the submissions of counsels of other respondents to the effect that respondent no.1 has no right, title or interest in the house in question, which is the self acquired property of his parents. He argued that respondent no.1 is living separately in a rented accommodation, where the applicants must come to join his company or he is also ready to pay them the rent as ordered by the court for some alternate accommodation. On the other hand, he argued on cross appeal filed by respondent no.1 that the amount of maintenance awarded to the applicants is on higher side. He submitted that the appellant is doing private job where his salary is Rs.32,595/- per month and as per his monthly income, the amount of maintenance awarded is neither reasonable nor justified. He prayed for reducing the amount of maintenance by altering the impugned order.

DISCUSSION & REASONING

12. To start with admitted facts, the matrimonial relation is admitted. The marriage was solemnized on 13.12.2006 and since then the parties to

marriage have resided in the matrimonial house in question i.e. House No. B-I-980/5, Daulat Street, opposite Police Line, Civil Lines, Ludhiana with respondents no.2 to 5. It is also admitted fact that the applicants are in possession of first floor of the house consisting of two rooms, a kitchen, lobby and a bathroom. Applicant no.2 was born and brought up in the matrimonial house. It is also admitted that multifarious litigation is pending between the parties. Respondent no.1 has filed a divorce case. The applicants, apart from this case, have instituted a civil suit and police complaints.

13. The applicants have pleaded that they are victims of domestic violence including physical, verbal, emotional and economic abuse. Learned trial court recorded its prima-facie satisfaction to that effect from the pleadings of the parties, wherein, the applicants have narrated different incidents of violence committed against them. The respondents have denied the allegations, however, it is admitted fact that there is matrimonial discord and multifarious litigation between the parties. The parties will lead evidence in support of their respective allegations and counter allegations. At this interim stage, the court is just to see the prima-facie case and balance of convenience, which from the pleadings and supporting affidavits is in favour of the applicants. The respondent no.1 in his cross appeal has primarily challenged the amount of maintenance on the ground that it is on higher side and the other respondents have not challenged the impugned order at all. It shows that the prima-facie satisfaction recorded by learned trial court that the domestic violence has

taken place against the applicants and thus, they are entitled to interim relief, is not under challenge.

14. Firstly, taking up the issue of interim maintenance, it is important to note that the material on record are the pleadings and the documents produced by the parties. The evidence in the case is yet to be led and the documents produced are mostly subject to their proof and admissibility in evidence. The right to maintenance is claimed only against respondent no.1, who has produced a salary slip showing his gross salary as Rs.35,000/- and inhand salary of Rs.32595/-. He has denied any other source of income. The applicants on the contrary produced income tax returns of respondent no.1, for year 2021-22 showing income of Rs.6,85,590/-, for year 2022-23 showing income of Rs.6,92,925/-. Even after claiming deductions towards contributions for provident fund and health insurance, the taxable income was more than what the respondent no.1 has claimed his salary to be. Thus, the salary certificate of respondent is not tenable for assessing his monthly income. The income tax returns are more reliable documents and as per the same, the income of respondent no.1 during year 2021 to 2023 has been more than Rs.6 lacs. Thus, learned trial court has rightly taken Rs.50,000/- per month to be the income of respondent no.1, for the purpose of assessment of maintenance for the applicants. Though, learned counsel for the applicants has produced the educational certificate of applicant no.2 to argue that her fee is much more than the awarded maintenance, however, the fact remains that it is an interlocutory stage, where the interim maintenance has been ordered in view of the overall status of the parties and prima-

facie proof of income of respondent no.1. Respondent no.1 has pleaded for its reduction, claiming inability to pay. Learned trial court has granted maintenance of Rs.4000/- each to the applicants per month from the date of application, Rs.10,000/- to applicant no.2 towards education expenses, which appears to be fairly reasonable at this interim stage, so as to save the applicants from destitution and vagrancy. The order as to interim maintenance, therefore, is based on correct appreciation of facts and material on record and calls for no interference.

15. Coming to the reliefs claimed in respect of matrimonial house, it has been pleaded by the applicants that the same is a shared household being joint ownership of the respondents, whereas latter have pleaded it to be self acquired property of respondents no.2 and 3 wherein respondent no.1 has no right, title or interest. The title document has been produced, prima-facie showing that respondent no.1 has no right, title or interest in the house. However, it is admitted fact that since the date of marriage in 2006, the applicants have resided on first floor of matrimonial house. It is also an admitted fact that respondents no.2 to 5 have resided in the same house on the ground floor, therefore, the parties till recent times have lived together as joint family having a common mess.

16. Accordingly, as per **Section 2(f) of D.V. Act**, the applicants are in “domestic relationship” not only with respondent no.1, but with other respondents as well, as through a relation of marriage with respondent no.1, the other respondents being family members have lived together with the applicants as joint family. Such a living of parties in a domestic relationship in the house in question, qualify it as a ‘shared household’

under **Section 2(s) of D.V. Act**. The definition is quite wide and it is not necessary that either the applicants or respondent no.1 has any right, title, interest or equity in the house. Even a household, which belongs to the joint family, of which the respondent no.1 is a member, qualifies as shared household irrespective of whether the respondent or aggrieved person has any right, title or interest therein. The jointness of the family is to be seen and not the joint ownership of the house in question.

17. It is the case of respondents that respondent no.1 is himself not residing in the house in question, thus, applicants are left with no right in the house and must join the company of respondent no.1. The applicants on the other hand have pleaded that respondent no.1 has deliberately withdrawn from their society. They are not ready to join his company and have claimed that it is only an eyewash just to oust them from the house. These allegations and counter allegations, therefore, touch the merits and are matter of evidence to be led by the parties. Only at the final stage, the court will decide, whether respondent no.1 has really started living separate from other respondents and if so, whether the house continues to be a shared household for the applicants or not. At this interim stage, the house in question is prima-facie a shared household as per the nature of its occupation by the parties since long.

18. Learned trial court discussed in detail the nature of house in question, the litigation pending between the parties and the nature of allegations to hold that the applicants are not entitled for relief of residence order under Section 19 of D.V. Act and, thus, proceeded to pass an order of rent of Rs.8000/- for alternative accommodation. Learned trial

court, however, failed in appreciating the correct nature of the apprehension and violence pleaded by the applicants and of the reliefs claimed in this regard under S. 23 D.V. Act. The applicants have clearly pleaded that the respondents are bent upon dispossessing them from the first floor of house in question, illegally and forcibly. They further claimed a right of residence therein till the main application is decided on merits. Learned trial court although, ordered for rent towards alternate accommodation, however, the impugned order is silent as to how the applicants shall be removed from the house in question and protection, if any, against any forcible and unlawful dispossession.

19. It is clear from the pleadings of the parties that the applicants are not ready to join respondent no.1 in a rented accommodation. Latter has filed a divorce petition, thus, has no interest in company of applicant no.1. The applicants have lawful occupation of first floor of the house since 2006. They are also not ready to vacate the house in question. In that scenario, the respondents cannot be given a free hand to unlawful recourse for dispossessing the applicants. They need to take appropriate legal course to take the possession of first floor of the house lawfully. An interim order passed under D.V. Act providing for rent towards alternate accommodations can be executed against respondent no.1 for recovery of such rent. It cannot be executed against the applicants for dispossessing them. Thus, till the appropriate legal recourse is adopted by respondents no.2 & 3, the applicants are required to be protected by passing an order under Section 19(1)(a) of D.V. Act for restraining the respondents from dispossessing them illegally, forcibly or except by due course of law.

Learned trial court fell in error in ignoring is important issue and passing such an order under S. 19(1)(a) of D.V. Act. It is only after the applicants are lawfully dispossessed that a question of passing an order of rent or alternate accommodation to save them from vagrancy will arise. The impugned order is accordingly not sustainable in law on that count and is required to be modified accordingly.

20. Learned counsel for the respondents, in support of their contentions, have placed reliance upon judgments **Manju Arora Vs. Neelam Arora & Anr.**, 2025 NCDHC 9456 (Delhi), **Sonia Mehra Vs. Romy Mehra & Ors.**, 2025 NCDHC 2025 (Delhi), **Usha Vs. Omwati, RSA-5367-2017(O&M) (P&H)**, **Jaidev Rajnikant Shroff Vs. Poonam Jaidev Shroff**, 2011(1) R.C.R. (Civil) 290 (SC). They argued that the right to residence cannot be claimed against the parents, particularly when the husband himself has no ownership in the house. That, the applicants cannot claim perpetual right of residence in the house, even when respondent no.1 has himself moved out of the house. That, the allegations and nature of litigation between parties is such that residing together is not possible. The arguments are not tenable and the judgments are differentiable from the facts of present case.

21. The first judgment in **Manju Arora's case** supra, is a case, where a civil court had directed the eviction of daughter in law from the self acquired house owned by senior citizen parents in law. Thus, the court held that the daughter in law has no right to claim residence therein under D.V. Act after the eviction having been ordered. There is no eviction order against the applicants in the present case till date. In the second judgment

in **Sonia Mehra's case** supra, the parties approached the civil court simultaneously seeking relief of injunction. The parents in law sought mandatory injunction for dispossession of daughter in law and latter sought permanent injunction for restraining them. The court took confidential report of a lady police officer as to actual and factual position of the site. The interest of minor children was also involved. The appeal arose from said civil litigation and not from an order passed under D.V. Act. Thus, it was in the appropriate civil proceedings that the court had ordered for mandatory injunction in favour of parents in law. In the present case, no such appropriate legal recourse has yet been adopted. The third judgment in **Usha's case** supra, is again in respect of a suit for possession instituted by mother in law, wherein, plea was taken by daughter in law that same is shared household. The court ordered that the possession is permissive in nature and daughter in law cannot claim perpetual right. The court decreed the suit for possession. These judgments are, thus, not applicable to the facts of this case as appropriate legal recourse is yet to be adopted by the respondents no.2 and 3 in the present case.

22. The last judgment in **Jaidev Rajnikant Shroff's case** supra, is concerning the strained relations between the parties, which do not make it suitable for them to live under same roof. The court held that their continuous living together may further result into criminal proceedings and escalation of dispute. In the present case, the parties are already litigating for quite some time. The applicants are in possession of a totally separate portion on first floor, which can be maintained separately.

Although, the house has same egress and ingress and stairs from ground floor, but all those areas are common portions for both the floors of house. The use of those portions, by itself does not amount to any interference by the parties in each other's possession. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the pending litigation or strained relations cannot be made the sole basis to deny the relief under Section 19(1)(a) of D.V. Act to the applicants.

23. The facts of the present case are better covered by the judgments **Sushil Kumar and Anr. Vs. Anita Kumari**, Law Finder Doc Id #2594611 (HP), **Khushwant Kaur Vs. Gagandeep Sidhu**, 2025 NCDHC 9240 (Delhi), wherein, the right of daughter in law to be protected against unlawful dispossession as interim measures has been upheld. In the second judgment, it was held that property exclusively owned by in-laws can qualify as shared household under S.2(s) of D.V. Act, if aggrieved woman lived there with her husband in domestic relationship and co-existence in distinct portions of the property ensures the protection of aggrieved without depriving lawful owner of possession of separate portion.

24. In view of the above discussion, without being oblivious of the basic fact that it is interim stage of proceedings under the D.V. Act, it follows that prima-facie, the applicants are in possession of a separate independent portion of house in question since 2006 and have lived therein as part of a joint family. Their possession is thus, lawful and they have a right to continue with the same, till removed therefrom by due process of law. The respondents no.2 and 3 have a legal right to have

recourse to appropriate legal remedy for getting back the possession of the portion in occupation of the applicants, however, till then, they have no right to use any forcible or illegal means. The applicants are, thus, entitled for an interim relief under Section 19(1)(a) for restraining the respondents from dispossessing them illegally and forcibly during the pendency of the main application. The impugned order passed by learned trial court regarding rent of Rs.8000/- payable by respondent no.1 to the applicant no.1, is unsustainable in law and liable to be set aside, for its decision either at the final stage after taking evidence of the parties or earlier, if the applicants are ordered to be evicted/dispossessed from matrimonial house in question by due process of law and they apply for such an interim relief.

Decision

25. In view of the discussion above and the reasons recorded, the appeal preferred by the applicants is partly allowed. The order directing respondent no.1 to pay rent of Rs.8000/- for alternate accommodation is set aside and the respondents are restrained from dispossessing the applicants from first floor of matrimonial house in question i.e. House No. B-I-980/5, Daulat Street, opposite Police Line, Civil Lines, Ludhiana either illegally, forcibly or except by due course of law till further orders. The appeal of the applicants for enhancement of maintenance amount as also the appeal of respondent no.1 for reduction of maintenance are dismissed and order as to maintenance is upheld.

26. The observation herein are for decision of these appeals and shall have no bearings on decision of the main application on merits by learned

trial court. The parties shall bear their own costs. A copy of this judgment be placed on file of connected appeal. Trial court record be returned along with copy of this judgment and appeal files be consigned to Judicial Record Room, Ludhiana.

Pronounced in open court on this 31st day of July, 2026.

**Manav
Addl. Sessions Judge,
Ludhiana, UID PB0299**

*Anil Kr. Rao SG-I
This judgment has been directly typed on dictation.*