
In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

**Civil Revision No.6992 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.10.2015.**

Gurpreet Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

Vijay Kumar

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present: Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Prantap Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?

KULDIP SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Challenge in the present revision dated 19.08.2015, passed by the Learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, vide which pending the disposal of application under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, maintenance of Rs.3000/- per month was awarded to the wife.

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

The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that as per Annexure P-4, respondent-husband is a Director of the company Atwal Sunder Grewal Marketing

Private Limited, which was incorporated in the 2015. Therefore, the counsel claims that he is having the income of Rs.2,00,000/- per month as Director.

I am of the view that this stand was pleaded before the Lower Court but in the absence of any proof regarding said income, the Lower Court took the income of the husband of Rs.19,500/- and granted the maintenance accordingly.

It is also not denying that the parties have two minor children from the marriage who are being looked after by the husband and he is paying the tuition and transportation fee i.e. of Rs.17,100/- and Rs.14,100/- respectively. He also claimed that he is paying the instalments of vehicle @ Rs.9000/- per month. The fact that the husband is looking after two school going children who are studying in English school and paying hefty tuition fee and other charges appears to have weighed in the mind of the Lower Court. Therefore, in the absence of the any proof of much higher income, there is nothing to interfere in the impugned order.

Revision stands dismissed.

October 19, 2015

Ankur

**(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE**