

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CR-2346-2014

Date of decision: 22.09.2015

Kamalpreet Singh Narang

..... Petitioner

Versus

Pavneet Kaur @ Gudia

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

PRESENT: Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Amit Dhawan, Advocate for the respondent.

AMIT RAWAL, J. (ORAL)

Challenge in the present petition is to the impugned order dated 06.02.2014 whereby an application filed by respondent-wife under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act has been allowed, vide which a sum of ₹ 10,000/- per month as maintenance *pendente lite* and ₹ 15,000/- as litigation expenses has been awarded.

Mr. Sandeep Arora, learned counsel appearing for petitioner-husband submits that respondent-wife has not been able to prove the income of petitioner-husband, therefore, the amount awarded towards maintenance *pendente lite* is phenomenal. He further submits that no doubt a minor child is residing with respondent-wife and at the best the amount of maintenance *pendente lite* could be assessed only after treating the income of petitioner-husband as a daily wager.

Mr. Amit Dhawan, learned counsel appearing for

respondent-wife submits that the petitioner is running a jewellery shop at Nawanshahar, though, in affidavit it was stated that his income is more than ₹ 1 lac per month.

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

The sole reason which weighed in the mind of trial Court to award maintenance *pendente lite* was on account of categoric pleadings that petitioner-husband was running a jewellery shop which was not specifically denied by him. In the absence of any specific denial to the pleadings in the corresponding paragraphs deemed to be however, admitted, in my view, there is no illegality or perversity in the impugned order awarding a sum of ₹ 10,000/- per month as maintenance *pendente lite* and ₹ 15,000/- as litigation expenses to respondent-wife, particularly when the respondent-wife is also maintaining a minor child.

The instant revision petition is devoid of merits and accordingly, the same is dismissed

September 22, 2015

rishu

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**