

IN THE COURT OF SUB-DIVISIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE (M), MARGHERITA:
TINSUKIA

MISC (D.V.) CASE NO: 02 OF 2016

U/Sec 12 OF PROTECTION OF WOMEN FROM DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT, 2005

SMTI. JASODA CHETRY

W/O: SRI MOHAN LAL CHETRY

ADDRESS: DIGBOI BORJAN GAON

P.O. & P.S. DIGBOI

DIST: TINSUKIA, ASSAM

..... COMPLAINANT

-Vs.-

SRI MOHAN LAL CHETRY

S/O: LATE TANKA BD. CHETRY

ADDRESS: DIGBOI BORJAN GAON

P.O. & P.S. DIGBOI

DIST: TINSUKIA, ASSAM

.....RESPONDENT

PRESENT: SALEH AHAMMAD, LL.M. AJS
SUB-DIVISIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE (M), MARGHERITA,
TINSUKIA

FOR THE COMPLAINANT/PETITIONER: Mr. BHABEN SARMA & Mrs. JURI GOGOI (KAUR),
LEARNED ADVOCATES

FOR THE RESPONDENTS: Mr. M.P. KSHETRA & SMTI RIMA DEY, LEARNED ADVOCATES

EVIDENCE RECORDED ON: 08-03-17, 19-12-17, 05-02-18 & 03-04-18

ARGUMENT HEARD ON: 22-05-18

JUDGMENT:

1. This case has arisen out of an application under section 12 of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 (hereinafter called as 'the Act') filed by petitioner JASODA CHETRY (hereinafter referred to as the Aggrieved person/complainant) against the respondent MOHAN LAL CHETRY, (hereinafter referred to as the Respondent). The aggrieved woman namely JASODA CHETRY has filed an application under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 against the respondent praying for the reliefs provided under Section 19 (1) (s), 20 of the said Act.
2. The petitioner's case in brief is that she was married with the respondent in the month of September 1976 as per the Hindu customs and rituals and after the marriage the complainant began to live her life with the Respondent at Jorhat. They were blessed with a female child namely Manju Chetry. After 3/ 4 years of her marriage and after the birth of her daughter her husband was appointed as Hindi teacher and during the said period he took a temporary resident at Tengakhat in Dibrugarh. During the said period her husband used to visit Ouguri gaon and during the said period the complainant also used to stay for some days at Tengakhat. The Respondent on 17-06-1983 unlawfully married one Smti Saraswati Chetry and began to live with her as husband and wife. She came to know about it along with her daughter which led to quarrel between both of them. It was on her request that the Headmaster of the school had arranged a monthly allowance of Rs. 250/- which was paid after deducting it from the salary of the Respondent. Thereafter, one year the Respondent brought her to Tengakhat and advised her to live there along with his illegally married wife. In the meanwhile, the 2nd son Madan Chetry was born while she was living at the house of the Respondent and the 2nd wife of the Respondent gave birth to three boys and they are elder to her son Madan Chetry. After one and half years of her son's birth the Respondent purchased a plot of land at Borjan gaon under Digboi P.S. and constructed a residential house. After the death of her in laws she stayed at the residential house of her husband at Borjan Gaon along with her daughter and son. The second wife of the Respondent and her three children were also living there. In the month of June, 2014 she was at the matrimonial house of her daughter she was at the matrimonial house of her daughter and at that time the Respondent suddenly came there and she was beaten along with her daughter Manju without any provocation and the

Respondent told her not to enter the house at Borjan Gaon. She was resisted from entering the residence at Borjan Gaon. She raised hue and cry and her neighbours came to rescue her and directed the Respondent to allow her to enter the house. Thereafter she was allowed to enter the house, but gradually the Respondent began to misbehave with her on different pretext. She was assaulted by the Respondent and deprived of food and clothing's. In the month of February 2015 a meeting was held at village level regarding the division of land. In the said meeting which was attended by the Respondent it was held that the Respondent would construct a three room pucca house for her used and would divide all the properties in three parts of which one part would be given to her. It was decided in the public meeting that until the house is constructed the Respondent to pay her Rs. 4,000/- per month for maintenance along with ten tins of paddy after construction of the said house one third of the monthly salary would be given to her and the same principle would apply in matter of pension and other retirement benefit of the Respondent. The Respondent was present there and he admitted and accepted all the conditions of the said meeting by putting his signature on a paper written in the said meeting. The Respondent constructed two roomed house for her but he has failed and neglected to pay the monthly allowance after 2/3 months and also stopped to give any quantity of paddy to her and thereby disobeyed the proposals made in the meeting. The Respondent is going to retire by the month of January 2017 and she is afraid that she would be deprived of the benefits. Finding no other alternative she has filed this petition u/s 12 of the Domestic Violence Act for the following reliefs: The aggrieved party claims the following reliefs:

- (i) Residence order u/s 19(i) directing the respondent to provide sufficient accommodation for the aggrieved person.
 - (ii) Monetary relief u/s 20 directing the respondent to provide food, clothes, medication and other basic necessities i.e. Rs. 10,000/- per month, house hold expenses Rs. 2000/- per month and any other expense Rs. 3000/- per month.
3. In this case, the respondent had totally denied the allegations in the written objections. The respondent has submitted that there is no cause of absence and the complainant has filed this case for an unlawful gain and it should be dismissed at the very initial stage. The complainant and Respondent's marriage was never solemnized as per the Hindu rites and rituals legally as it was a love affair amongst them and a daughter was conceived during that period. At that time the complainant and Respondent along with their daughter resided at Ouguri Nepali gaon under Jorhat District and the Respondent was a farmer along with his father. In the year 1981 the Respondent was appointed

as Hindi teacher at Dihinghula public ME school and from 1996 he was transferred to Tengakhat Borhula MV school. The complainant along with her daughter went on her own accord to the house of her parents in the month of May 1980 without informing the Respondent or his family members. The Respondent after getting knowledge of desertion by his wife went to her parent's residence to persuade her to come back but it went in vain. The Respondent after repeated persuasion could not bring her back. After nearly three years when all the family members of the Respondent saw that the complainant did not return back the Respondent was in great plight both physically and mentally and at that time the Respondent was compelled to marry one Smti Swaraswati Chetry which was an arranged marriage and was performed as per Hindu rites and rituals on 17-06-1983. The complainant came with her daughter at the house of the respondent at Ouguri Nepali Gaon on 22/06/1987 of her own accord on the pretext of asking forgiveness of what wrongful act she had done by depriving the respondent from giving fatherly love and affection towards his daughter. The respondent felt pity upon the complainant took the complainant along with his family members. The said illegality of marriage with SMTI. SARASWATI CHETRY must be proved by the complainant herself in due legal manner. The respondent has also stated that he has discharged all his duties and responsibilities and obligations towards the said complainant along with his present wife fulfilling all her demands, necessities of life and took care of her health by providing necessary treatment from Doctors. The complainant always used to involve in quarrel with the respondent without any justifiable ground in spite of taking due care with love and affection by the respondent. The relation between him and the complainant arose out of love affair and no marriage was ever been held. But the marriage between the respondent and his present wife SMTI. SARASWATI CHETRY was held by the Hindu rites and rituals and hence SMTI. SARASWATI CHETRY is the due legally married wife of the respondent. The complainant has been residing along with her younger son SRI MADAN CHETRY who is about 25 years old and is quite capable of looking after all the needs and necessity of the complainant. It is submitted that as per law the retirement benefits or other benefits that the respondent's may get /receive can be enjoyed by his wife, daughter and all sons only after his death as a successor/legal heir. The respondent has submitted that the prayer of the complainant for granting/ passing either residence orders, monetary relief and such other orders as prayed by the complainant for herself be dismissed. The complainant has prayed that the cost towards monetary relief to the respondent be rejected.

I have heard the arguments for the learned counsel of the petitioner and also perused the case record including the evidence of all the witnesses. The defence side had filed evidence on affidavit but the case record reveals that the respondent side has been absent since a long time after filing of his evidence on affidavit and hence this court had dispensed with the cross examination of DW'S for the ends of justice. As the evidence on affidavit has been expunged from this case this court has to decide the application u/sec 12 of DV ACT only on the basis of the evidence of PW'S.

POINT OF DETERMINATION

POINT OF DETERMINATION NO.1:

Whether the petitioner/complainant is an aggrieved person and entered into a domestic relationship with the respondent?

POINT OF DETERMINATION NO.2:

Whether the respondent has subjected the aggrieved woman to domestic violence?

POINT OF DETERMINATION NO.3:

Whether the petitioner /complainant has resided at the shared household with the respondent?

POINT OF DETERMINATION NO.4:

Whether the aggrieved woman is entitled to get the reliefs as prayed for from the respondent under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005?

DISCUSSION, DECISION AND REASON THEREOF:

For the sake of convenience all the points are clubbed together:

4. PW1 in her evidence on affidavit has deposed that she had sought relief u/s 19, 20 of D.V Act claiming an amount of Rs. 10,000/- per month for food, clothes, medications and other basic necessities. Rs. 2000/- per month on account of household expenses

and Rs. 3,000/- on account of other expenses i.e. to the tune of Rs. 15,000/- per month. She is the legally married wife of the Respondent and they were blessed with one male and female child. Her husband is a government teacher of ME school at Tengakhat Borhula and he earns a salary of Rs. 50,000/- per month. At present she is unable to present the salary certificate of her husband, but she will get the same under the RTI Act. She was very happy with her husband, but after the marriage she was subjected to physical and mental torture by her husband when he came in contact with one Saraswati Chetry with whom her husband performed 2nd marriage which is illegal and unlawful during the subsistence of the 1st marriage. It was the concubine of her husband who gave her physical and mental torture and the said concubine tried to oust her and her children from the house of her husband. She always quarrel with her and her husband did not give any heed or protection to her from the said torture. In the month of February 2015 the neighbours of her husband saw the continuous quarrel and torture upon her. A public meeting was held regarding the division of land and they also decided and directed her husband for the construction of three pucca room house for her and also instructed her husband to divide all the properties of her husband in three parts out of which one part would be given to her. In the said public meeting it was held that till the construction of the said house her husband would pay her Rs. 4,000/- per month and maintenance along with ten tins of paddy and after the construction of the said house one third of monthly salary would be given to her and the said principle would be applied in the matters of pension and other retirement benefits of her husband. The said terms and conditions were accepted by her husband in the public meeting held on February, 2015. It was her husband who constructed two room house for her in place of three room house, but failed to provide her monthly maintenance after providing for 2/3 months and thereby disobeyed his own agreement as per the public meeting. She does not have her own earning and is presently living at the mercy of her neighbours.

5. During her cross examination she stated that she did not submit any document to show that she was married with Mohan Lal Chetry. She did not mention the place where her marriage was solemnized. Their marriage was solemnized in the house of the Respondent's elder sister. In the marriage function her family members as well as the family members of the Respondent were present. The marriage was solemnized in the year 1976. Her daughter was born after one year of marriage. At present she is staying with her son. She had stated that her husband married again but she did not file any case in this aspect. Her son is aged 25 years. It was her husband who

constructed a house for her nearby his house which is now in a dilapidated condition. Her daughter was aged 38 years. She had filed this case for monetary relief from her husband. Her son is unemployed and he does not provide her maintenance. She does not remember the exact dates on which she was subjected to physical and mental torture by her husband. The suggestions put forward are of total denial.

6. PW2 in his evidenced on affidavit has supported the version of PW-1 and it has been mentioned in the evidence on affidavit that the Respondent is getting a salary of Rs. 50,000/- per month and after retirement he gets Rs. 30,000/- per month as pension.
7. During his cross examination he stated that he is a service holder at PHC. He knows the aggrieved person since the last 25 years. Their houses are situated nearby one another. He does not know the contents of his evidence on affidavit.
8. PW-3 in her evidence has supported the version of PW-1 i.e. her mother. She knows that her father was receiving a monthly salary of Rs. 50,000/- per month and after retirement he is getting a monthly pension of Rs. 30,000/- only. The Respondent has received Rs. 15 lakhs to Rs. 20 lakhs as retirement benefit. It has become difficult for her mother to even get one days meal.
9. During her cross examination she has stated that the aggrieved person and the Respondent are her parents. Her mother is presently residing at her own house along with her brother which was constructed by her father. Her brother is at Bangalore and he does not have any job. The co-villagers told her that her mother is the legally married wife of the Respondent. At the time of filing the case her mother was residing separately from her father in the house constructed by him nearby his original house. Her parents used to quarrel before filing the case and immediately before filing this case their quarrel increased. She came to know that her father performed 2nd marriage with Saraswati Chetry. The suggestions put forward are of total denial.

STAGE OF APPRECIATION OF EVIDENCE

10. From the perusal of the evidence of PW'S it appears where it needs to be proved at the prima facie stage that the woman is an aggrieved party or not. *Section 2(a) of THE PROTECTION OF WOMEN FROM DOMESTIC VIOLENCE Act, 2005 (in short as the ACT) defines "aggrieved person" means any woman who is, or has been, in a domestic relationship with the respondent and who alleges to have been subjected to any act of domestic violence by the respondent."*
11. In this case, from the perusal of the evidence of PW'S it appears that the marriage has been solemnized between the aggrieved party and the respondent and this has been proved and this has been brought to light during the cross examination of PW1 as well

as from the evidence of PW3. It has also come to light that the marriage took place in 1976. But it has been admitted by PW1 that she couldn't produce any document with regard to her marriage with Mohan Lal Chetry. Now, one of the moot question arises that whether the marriage took place or not. The use of the word parent's during the cross examination of PW3 itself makes that it clear that the respondent is the father of the PW3. There is a dispute relating to marriage between the complainant and the respondent i.e. as to legally married wife of the respondent which has been raised by the defence side. But the said is matter of fact which needs to prove by the defence side. But even if it is presumed for the sake of argument that the complainant is not the legally married wife of the respondent but it appears that they were in a relationship since 1976 and the law is quite clear on this issue and it also accepts "live in relationship" between the parties. The evidence of PW2 has clearly stated that the complainant and the respondent are legally married wife. But this evidence of PW2 had remained unturned during the cross examination of PW2. Even it appears that the complainant is not the wife of the respondent but the continuous use of the expression "husband" in cross examination by the learned defence counsel itself shows that the complainant is the wife of the respondent.

12. This itself makes it clear that the petitioner can be said to be aggrieved woman.
13. Section 3 of the DOMESTIC VIOLENCE ACT deals with the definition of domestic violence.
14. Violence against Women may be understood to encompass but not limited to physical, sexual and psychological violence occurring in the family and in the community, including battery, sexual abuse of female children, dowry related violence, marital rape, female genital mutilation and other traditional practices harmful to women, non-spousal violence, violence related to exploitation, sexual harassment and intimidation at work in educational institutions and elsewhere, trafficking in women, forced prostitution and violence perpetrated or condoned by the state.¹
15. From the perusal of the evidence of PW'S it appears that there were economic abuse, physical abuse as well as verbal & emotional abuse by the respondent and it was duty cast upon the respondent to look after his wife. At this juncture I would also like to point it out that the aggrieved party has failed to produce any medical documents nor was any case lodged in this connection in this regard. However, the petitioner has also failed to mention the exact dates of physical & mental torture upon her. It's a common

¹ KAMALJEET SINGH (IN JUDICIAL CUSTODY) Vs. STATE 148 (2008)DLT 170

phenomenon wherein it is not possible to remember the exact dates. But the respondent marrying another woman and thereafter living his life with her is itself a mental torture upon a woman who has been subjected to mental torture and pain because of the second marriage when her first marriage is in existence. There is also an element of verbal & emotional abuse which can be seen from the evidence of PW1 wherein she was subjected to a mental torture wherein she tolerated the torture upon her. This itself is in the form of an emotional abuse for a woman.

16. Hence, in such a case it could only be said that there was a sort of economic abuse, physical as well as emotional abuse whereby the respondent has deprived her of her basic necessities of life.
17. In this case let me us have a look at the definition of "**Domestic relationship**" and *it is defined under Section 2(f) of the Act as a relationship between two persons who live or have, at any point of time, lived together in a shared household, when they are related by consanguinity, marriage or through a relationship in the nature of marriage, adoption or are family members living together as a joint family.*"
18. In this case from close scrutiny of the evidence of PW'S it appears that the aggrieved woman was in a domestic relationship in the nature of marriage with the respondent.
19. However, in this case it appears that in order to prove the domestic relationship between the aggrieved party and the respondent which means "*as a relationship between two persons who live or have, at any point of time, lived together in a shared household, when they are related by consanguinity, marriage or through a relationship in the nature of marriage, adoption or are family members living together as a joint family.*"
20. Similarly, in this case this court agrees on the view that there was a relationship between the aggrieved party and the respondent. In order to establish a domestic relationship it must be brought to light that the aggrieved party and the respondent must have lived together in a shared house hold. They were living in a shared household wherein after the second marriage of the respondent the problems arouse with her and the second wife of the respondent had oust her from her family which led to quarrel.
21. It has come to light that the aggrieved party was staying at the house of the respondent which is clear from her evidence on affidavit and there is no cross examination of PW1 on this aspect and the said remained static during the cross examination.

22. At this stage, I would like to point it out that as far as the concept of shared household is concerned it has been brought to light that the respondent & his wife were living together and hence a duty was upon him to look after the aggrieved party or she is entitled for shared household. It has become quite clear that he had performed a second marriage. It is evident from the evidence of PW3 that the quarrels had increased day by day and thereafter this case was filed. It has been admitted by PW1 that her husband had constructed a house for her nearby his house but the said house is in a dilapidated condition.
23. I would also like to point it out that a claim has been made for residence orders. It is the duty of respondent to look after the aggrieved party.
24. The aggrieved party has sought for reliefs under section 19 & 20 of the Act. To determine if she is entitled to the sought reliefs the material on record is looked into.
25. *Relief under Section 19 of the Act:* The aggrieved party while adducing evidence has stated that *"A public meeting was held regarding the division of land and they also decided and directed her husband for the construction of three pucca room house for her and also instructed her husband to divide all the properties of her husband in three parts out of which one part would be given to her. In the said public meeting it was held that till the construction of the said house her husband would pay her Rs. 4,000/- per month and maintenance along with ten tins of paddy and after the construction of the said house one third of monthly salary would be given to her and the said principle would be applied in the matters of pension and other retirement benefits of her husband. The said terms and condition were accepted by her husband in the public meeting held on February, 2015. It was her husband who constructed two room house for her in place of three room house, but failed to provide her monthly maintenance after providing for 2/3 months and thereby disobeyed his own agreement as per the public meeting."* This evidence of PW1 had remained unturned during the cross examination of PW1 but it has been brought to light that her husband had constructed a house for her and the said is not a good condition.
26. There is evidence on record to show that she is having problems in her life but her husband had constructed two room house for her in place of three room house. But the evidence on record of PW1 which mentions about the agreement which took place at the village level has not been brought to the knowledge of this court nor the said terms and conditions which took place at the public meeting was marked as Exhibit in this case. This is apparent on the face of the record that the respondent had provided her a separate accommodation of two roomed house but the said is in a dilapidated

condition. Hence, in this regard I have already clarified that the duty is cast upon respondent and there cannot be burden upon her children when her husband is alive to provide her house or a rented accommodation. But when the wife of the respondent is living her life in a dilapidated house there is a duty cast upon her husband to repair it so that it can become fruitful for her to live in.

27. At this stage, I would also like to point it out there is no earning source of the complainant. But on the other hand her husband was a school teacher and he had retired from his job and he gets a monthly salary of Rs. 50,000/- per month but PW1 has failed to adduce the salary certificate of the respondent despite time being granted. The evidence of PW2 & PW3 points out that the respondent has retired from his job and he gets a monthly pension of Rs. 30,000/- per month and has received Rs. 15 lakhs to Rs. 20 lakhs as retirement benefits. There is no such document produced in this regard by the complainant side as to his retirement & pension benefits. It also appears from the evidence of PW1 that the respondent had married another woman and hence this also becomes a genuine ground to claim a separate accommodation for herself. The son of the respondent is a major one and her daughter is already married. There cannot be a duty cast upon their children to look after the complainant when her husband is alive.
28. *Relief under Section 20 of the Act.* : The complainant sought monetary relief u/S 20 of the Act. She sought Rs. 15,000/- per month on account of her food, clothes, medications, household expenses & other basic necessities.
29. On perusal of the evidence on record it appears that the respondent was working as a teacher and after his retirement he gets a pension of Rs. 30,000/- per month. There is no doubt that the respondent is a teacher but during the cross examination of PW'S the question relating to the salary, pension & other retirement benefits had remained silent. There is no other option available at the hands of the court but to accept the contentions to some extent where the petitioner has failed to adduce the salary slips, pension & retirement benefits. This cannot be denied that the respondent is not having his income and as of now if he has retired from service he will have his pension & retirement benefits.
30. This is apparent and clear during the cross examination of PW'S that he is having two wives and he is having his retirement benefits being a retired school teacher.
31. Hence, the pension of the respondent couldn't be made clear by the complainant side. It has also come to light the complainant doesn't have her source of income and she cannot be allowed to live at the mercy of her children.

32. *This court has also taken into consideration the Domestic Incident Report which has been submitted in this case by the complainant side. It appears from the perusal of the same that the complainant was subjected to domestic violence which was in the form of physical & mental torture. The relationship has also been established where in it has been found that the respondent is the husband of the complainant. It also appears that she has been subjected to verbal and emotional abuse, economic violence. She has also been deprived of her residential accommodation & monetary benefits wherein a woman aged 51 years had to knock the doors of the court for relief.*
33. *This court hereby finds it difficult to accept (i.e. Rs. 30,000/-) the amount of pension per month received by the respondent in absence of any such documents produced by the complainant side. However, it is his bounden duty to look after the aggrieved party. The right to life/ livelihood of the aggrieved party couldn't be curtailed and it would be violation of Article 21 of the Constitution of India. This has also come to light that the respondent is having his second wife. The duty is cast upon the respondent to look after his wife.*
34. Accordingly, the respondent is directed to pay the aggrieved party maintenance amount of Rs. 8000/- (Rupees eight Thousand) per month from the date of this order as monetary benefits for her which will include her food, clothes, medications, household expenses & other basic necessities.
35. Crystallizing the above discussion and findings it is hereby directed that the Respondent is to pay monetary relief of Rs. 8000/- (Rupees eight thousand) for the complainant/aggrieved party from the date of this order as monetary benefits for her which will include her food, clothes, medications, household expenses & other basic necessities. This order of monetary relief is to take effect on and from 19/07/19. The reason behind ordering from the date of order is that respondent is having a limited source of income after his retirement from service and considering the status of the respondent and his pension benefits being not proved by the complainant side I am of the opinion that if the order is made from the date of filing of application there would be a huge arrear amount and it wouldn't be possible for him to bear it. Hence, I deemed it fit that the order of monetary relief is to take effect from the date of this order.
36. There is no orders passed for separate residence u/sec 19 of the D.V. ACT as the complainant has been residing in a separate house constructed by the respondent. The respondent is hereby directed to repair the two roomed house where the complainant presently resides which is in a dilapidated condition as soon as possible.

Till the said house is repaired the respondent is directed to provide Rs. 2000/- per month to the aggrieved woman for a suitable rented accommodation near his house and he is directed to pay the said amount as rent expenses on a monthly basis to her. But the said rent allowance is subjected to the repairing of the old two roomed house and once the old two roomed house is repaired the said rent allowance of Rs. 2000/- per month shall come to an end.

ORDER

37. ***In light of the discussion made above, it is hereby held that the Respondent is to pay monthly monetary relief of Rs. 8,000/- (Rupees eight thousand) per month for the aggrieved party from the date of this order as monetary benefits for her which will include her food, clothes, medications, household expenses & other basic necessities. This order of monetary relief is to take effect on and from 19/07/19. The reason behind ordering from the date of order is that respondent is having a limited source of income after his retirement from service and considering the status of the respondent and his pension benefits being not proved by the complainant side I am of the opinion that if the order is made from the date of filing of application there would be a huge arrear amount and it wouldn't be possible for him to bear it. Hence, I deemed it fit that the order of monetary relief is to take effect from the date of this order.***
38. ***There is no orders passed for separate residence u/sec 19 of the D.V. ACT as the complainant has been residing in a separate house constructed by the respondent. The respondent is hereby directed to repair the two roomed house where the complainant presently resides which is in a dilapidated condition as soon as possible. Till the said house is repaired the respondent is directed to provide Rs. 2000/- per month to the aggrieved woman for a suitable rented accommodation near his house and he is directed to pay the said amount as rent expenses on a monthly basis to her. But the said rent allowance is subjected to the repairing of the old two roomed house and once the old two roomed house is repaired the said rent allowance of Rs. 2000/- per month shall come to an end.***
39. ***A copy of this order is to be furnished to the parties to this case and to the in charge of Police Station within the local limits of whose jurisdiction the parties reside and work for information and necessary action.***

40. *Also, send a copy of this order to the Protection Officer, Tinsukia for his/her information and necessary action.*

Given under my hand and seal of this court on this the 19th day of JULY, 2019
at MARGHERITA COURT

SALEH AHAMMAD

SUB-DIVISIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE (M),

MARGHERITA, TINSUKIA

APPENDIX:

WITNESSES FROM THE SIDE OF THE AGGRIVED PARTY:

PW1: SMTI. JASODA CHETRY

PW2: SRI GANESH SWARGARI

PW3: SMTI. MANJU CHETRY

WITNESSES FROM THE SIDE OF RESPONDENT: NIL

1ST PARTY EXHIBITS: NIL

2nd PARTY EXHIBITS: NIL

SALEH AHAMMAD

SUB-DIVISIONAL JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE (M),

MARGHERITA, TINSUKIA