

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.8421 of 2015
Date of decision: 10.12.2015

Mukesh

... Petitioner

Versus

Pinki

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI

Present: Mr. Shilak Ram Hooda, 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?

ARUN PALLI J. (Oral)

Vide order being assailed, dated 28.04.2015, rendered by Additional District Judge, Panipat, respondent-wife had since been granted maintenance pendente lite as also the litigation expenses. The conclusion recorded by the court reads as thus:

“3. I have heard learned counsel on behalf of both the sides and perused the record carefully. Arguments have been advanced in terms of the pleadings. Marriage between the parties is not disputed. Birth of their children two children is also not disputed. At this stage, perusal of the file shows that there is nothing on record to show the income of both the parties. Photocopy of disability certificate of respondent is required to be proved by way of evidence. Even otherwise, the respondent is duty bound to maintain his wife and children,

therefore, interest of justice would be met if applicant-wife is held entitled to Rs.2000/- per month as maintenance from the date of filing of application and Rs.2000/- as litigation expenses from respondent. It is accordingly ordered.”

Concededly, respondent is the legally wedded wife of the petitioner and, thus, the later is under obligation to maintain her. Nothing was brought on record, least any cogent or credible material, to show that she has any independent source of income and is, thus, equipped to maintain herself and her children.

That being so, no interference is warranted in exercise of revisional jurisdiction. Petition being devoid of merit is accordingly dismissed.

December 10, 2015
Rajan

(Arun Palli)
Judge