

THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA,
AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-11986 of 2013

Decided on : 04.02.2015

Savita

... Petitioner

Versus

Dharamender and another

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr.Jitender Nara, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr.Surender Saini, Advocate for the respondents.

- i. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
- ii. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
- iii. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Ajay Tewari, J. (Oral)

Learned counsel for the respondents states that he does not wish to file reply.

This petition has been filed against the order of the courts below whereby a sum of Rs.4000/- has been ordered to be paid to the petitioner for her accommodation at Panipat.

The precise argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that she be allowed to stay in the matrimonial home at village Naultha but this prayer cannot be allowed, then the amount of Rs.4000/- ordered by the courts below is highly inadequate and it should be increased to Rs.5,000/- since no decent accommodation is available in Panipat at that rate. Learned counsel for the respondents has argued that the amount of Rs.4,000/- which has been awarded by the courts below is sufficient for the petitioner.

After going through the facts of the case, in my considered opinion, it would be appropriate that amount of rent is enhanced to Rs.4500/- per month from the date of application.

Petition stands disposed of.

[Ajay Tewari]
Judge

04.02.2015
sd