

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

**CR No.1053 of 2015
Date of Decision:24.02.2015**

Sarabjit Singh

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

Rajdeep Kaur and another

. . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAKESH KUMAR JAIN

Present: Mr.Avninder Kumar Kalsy, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RAKESH KUMAR JAIN, J. (ORAL)

This petition is directed against the order dated 25.11.2013, allowing the application of the respondents, filed under Section 19 of the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956 [for short 'the Act'], directing the petitioner to pay ₹2500/- per month to the daughter-in-law and ₹2500/- per month to the grand-daughter. Admittedly, the son of the petitioner has expired therefore, the widowed daughter-in-law has filed the application under Section 19 of the Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that as per Section 19(2) of the Act, the respondents would be entitled to maintenance only from the coparcenary property in the hands of the petitioner. It is submitted that no such finding has been returned by the trial Court, therefore, the impugned order is illegal.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after examining the record, have found that in reply filed to the application there is no averment made by the petitioner that the

VIVEK PATHWA
2015.02.25 16:04
I attest to the accuracy and
authenticity of this document

property in his hands measuring 80 kanals is not a coparcenary property. Therefore, I do not find any error in the impugned order.

Dismissed.

24.02.2015

Vivek

**(RAKESH KUMAR JAIN)
JUDGE**