

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No. 4344 of 2013 (O/M)
Date of decision : 24.8.2015

Rohit Kukreja

..... Revisionist

Versus

Savita

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. Akshay Jindal, Advocate, for the revisionist.

Mr. Virender Dhull, Advocate, for,
Mr. Rahul Deswal, Advocate, for respondent.

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

-. -

-. -

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Impugned in the present revision is the order dated 22.5.2013 (Annexure-P-3), passed by the learned District Judge, Karnal, vide which pending the disposal of the application under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, (in short 'the Act'), filed by the husband, in an application under Section 24 of the Act, moved by the wife, interim maintenance at the rate of Rs. 20,000/- per month was awarded to the wife from the date of filing of the petition i.e. 30.8.2012. The litigation expenses to the tune of Rs.

CR No. 4344 of 2013 (O/M)

-2-

5,000/- were also allowed.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also carefully gone through the file.

Learned counsel for the revisionist has argued that before the lower Court, it was argued that the income of the revisionist is Rs. 14,000/- per month from his employment in Waxpol Industries Private Limited, Kolkata, where he is working on probation. However, it was wrongly recorded by the learned District Judge that the counsel had argued that his income is Rs. 40,000/- per month. The learned counsel has also relied upon the appointment letter (Annexure-P-4) in the said Waxpol Industries Limited, where his income is mentioned as Rs. 14,000/- per month.

After going through the impugned order and the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that there is no illegality or infirmity in the impugned order. The appointment in the said Waxpol Industries Limited is only from 2.1.2013, whereas the present petition for divorce was filed in the year 2011. The lower Court has relied upon the bio data produced by the revisionist, which shows that he was working in various companies and was getting pay package of Rs. 7.81 lacs per year. Therefore, it is unlikely that he will work with very meager salary in a new company and that too on probation. He could easily get the same job from some other company. The present revisionist has cleverly not produced the

CR No. 4344 of 2013 (O/M)

income record of the previous company to show much salary he was getting from his previous employment and different companies.

The learned counsel for the revisionist has further argued that the wife was appointed in HDFC Bank. He produced the appointment letter. However, the appointment letter does not show whether the wife had joined any bank and no averment was made in the petition that the wife is working in a particular branch of HDFC bank and on which date she had joined. After the marriage, the parties were living jointly and if the wife was working in a particular branch of the bank, this must have been within the knowledge of the husband. It being so, I do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned order. The present revision is accordingly dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

24.8.2015
sjks