

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

Civil Revision No.1060 of 2013 (O&M)

Date of Decision: September 17, 2015

Taranjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Karamjit Kaur

...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.Sandeep Khunger, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr.Salil Bali, Advocate,
for the respondent.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (Oral)

The challenge in the present revision petition is to the impugned order dated 3.1.2013 (Annexure P-7) passed by the Additional District Judge, Ferozepur, whereby application filed at the behest of the respondent-wife under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act (for short “the Act”), has been allowed and a sum of ₹6,000/- per month as maintenance pendente lite for herself and her son has been awarded w.e.f. 4.5.2011, i.e., the date of filing of the application till the disposal of the main petition under Section 13 of the Act, besides a sum of ₹2,000/- as litigation expenses.

Mr.Sandeep Khunger, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that vide judgment and decree dated 13.8.2014, divorce petition has been allowed and the petitioner has been granted divorce.

In view of the fact that divorce has been granted to the petitioner-husband, I do not find any illegality and perversity in the order awarding maintenance pendente lite to the tune of ₹6,000/- per month. The impugned order cannot be said to be without reasons.

In case any arrears are due, the petitioner is directed to make the payment of the same to the respondent-wife.

The revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

September 17, 2015
ramesh

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE