

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

Civil Revision No.1068 of 2015
Date of Decision: December 14, 2015

Smt.Kavita

...Petitioner

Versus

Abhishek Bhandari

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL, JUDGE

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

**Present: Mr.Vikas Kumar, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

As per the office report, requisite charges for effecting munadi have not been deposited and, therefore, munadi could not be issued.

The present petition has been filed by the petitioner-wife against the order dated 1.3.2014, whereby the application claiming maintenance pendente lite and litigation expenses has been declined.

The petitioner-wife in a divorce petition filed by her against her husband filed an application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act that her husband is earning ₹70,000/- per month as he is working as Assistant Manager Marketing in TLPL Shipping & Logistics Pvt.Ltd., New Delhi. The trial Court has committed illegality and perversity in declining the application by noticing that the petitioner was earlier working with VAGS Infotech South Extension and drawing ₹25,000/-. Now she has joined JP Institute and earning more than ₹40,000/- plus perks.

I have heard the learned counsel for petitioner and appraised the paper book.

The petitioner did not disclose in application about her present vocation. It is only in reply, the husband disclosed about the salary. It is settled law that the person, who seeks equity must do equity and if approaches the Court with concealment, will be dealt with sternly. The petitioner has even indulged into filing FIR against her husband-respondent. On the basis of the registration of aforementioned FIR, he has been removed from the employment, whereas she has been working in the J.P.Institute and earning ₹40,000/-, which fact is not disputed by filing any subsequent affidavit. I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order, whereby the application claiming maintenance pendente lite has been declined.

Since the husband is not working, whereas the petitioner is earning sufficient amount, she is able to maintain even the child also.

Accordingly, the revision petition stands dismissed.

December 14, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE