

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

**CR No.7905 of 2014
Date of decision: 20.08.2015**

Mrs. Chitra ... Petitioner
Vs.

Col. Narinder Kumar ... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. Zorawar Singh, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Abhinav Gupta, Advocate, for the respondent.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

Challenge in the present petition is to the order dated 6.10.2014, whereby, the second application for enhancement of the maintenance *pendent-lite* has been dismissed by the Additional District Judge, Jalandhar.

Mr. Zorawar Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that originally, the trial Court vide order dated 11.04.2013 had granted maintenance pendent-lite @ ₹ 10,000/- per month to the petitioner. However, owing to the change of the circumstances, another application for enhancement of the maintenance pendent-lite, has been filed which has been dismissed by the Additional District Judge, Jalandhar, vide order dated 06.10.2014. It has been averred that the Court has not taken

into consideration the fact that earlier the petitioner was living with the respondent and thereafter, they have shifted to the native village of her husband, where, he has his ancestral house and, thus, both the spouses are living in the same house, i.e, petitioner on the first floor and respondent on the ground floor, therefore, she needs more money in order to sustain herself.

Mr. Abhinav Gupta, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent submits that the second application for enhancement of maintenance *pendent-lite*, was moved within a short span of time, has rightly been dismissed, vide order dated 6.10.2014,, as the first application was allowed only on 11.04.2013. Thus, the impugned order is fair, legal and justified.

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

It is a matter of record that the petitioner has though shifted but residing in the ancestral house of the respondent-husband. Though, there is no change of circumstances and the impugned order does not suffer from any illegality, much less, perversity and the same cannot be said to be passed without jurisdiction .

Accordingly, the revision petition is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

August 20, 2015
savita