

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**Cr. Revision (FC) No. 3/2024****Date of decision: 19.09.2026****Balvinder Singh****.....Petitioner****Versus****Rekha Devi****.....Respondent****Coram****The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.****The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Yogesh Jaswal, Judge.*****Whether approved for reporting?¹*****For the Petitioner** : Mr. Bhim Raj Sharma, Advocate vice
Mr. Beli Ram Sharma, Advocate.**For the Respondent** : Mr. Subhash Mohan Snehi,
Advocate.**Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge (Oral)**

By way of this revision petition, the petitioner has assailed the order passed by the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Kinnaur at Rampur Bushahar, District Shimla in Case No. 75/2020, titled as Babli Devi versus Balvinder Singh. In terms whereof, the petition filed by the respondent therein under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for grant of monthly maintenance allowance stands disposed of by the learned Court below by awarding maintenance of ₹4,000/- per month to the wife from the date of the petition.

¹***Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?Yes***

2. Having heard the counsel for the parties and having perused the impugned order, we are of the considered view that there is no infirmity in the order. A perusal of the impugned order demonstrates that the petitioner-husband was serving as an Electrician in HRTC at the time when the impugned order was passed and his salary was ₹22,000/- per month. In the light of the fact that the petitioner was earning ₹22,000/- per month from his employer i.e. HRTC, maintenance to the tune of ₹4,000/- to the wife, cannot be said to be maintenance granted on the higher side.

3. Though learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was looking after his school going son and also his aged parents, but in terms of the impugned order, the parents of the petitioner were having their own property and thus, they were not dependent upon the petitioner per se for their upkeep. Besides this, even if the petitioner-husband was looking after his son, in the light of the fact that he was earning wages of ₹22,000/- per month, maintenance to the tune of ₹4,000/- to the present respondent, who is not having any other source of income, cannot be said to be an amount which is on the higher side. The husband is both morally and socially duty-bound to look after his wife and the order of the learned Court below, in this backdrop, cannot be said to be a perverse order in the facts and circumstances of the case.

4. Therefore, we see no reason to interfere with the order under challenge. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed. Pending

miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

(Yogesh Jaswal)
Judge

19th September, 2026.
(yogesh)