

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 5081 of 2015
Date of decision : August 12, 2015

Kanaiya

..... Petitioner

Versus

Pooja

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Narinder Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

The challenge in the present revision petition is to the order dated 21.5.2015 whereby an application filed under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 by the respondent in an application filed under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 has been allowed and a maintenance pendente lite of a sum of ₹5,000/- per month plus ₹5,000/- as litigation expenses has been awarded.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the proceedings initiated under Section 125 Cr.P.C as an interim measure a compensation of ₹5,000/- has been awarded, though it is under challenge.

There is no illegality and perversity in the order of

the trial Court. The Additional District and Sessions Judge, Patiala has assessed the compensation by taking the income of the petitioner as ₹12,000/- per month by applying the analogy of minimum wages per day.

There is no illegality and perversity in the order. The order is not without jurisdiction. However, it is made clear that the amount of maintenance already paid by the petitioner, in pursuance to the order passed under Section 125 Cr.P.C., if any, shall be adjusted.

The civil revision is dismissed with the aforementioned directions.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

August 12 , 2015
archana