

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43264 of 2013

Date of decision : August 04, 2015

Ajay Kumar

... Petitioner

vs.

Ramesh Rani and Anr.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Chandeeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep K. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Atul Bhatia, Advocate for
Mr. K.C. Bhatia, Advocate
for respondents No.1 and 2.

Surinder Gupta, J

Heard.

Out of salary of petitioner, whose gross salary was ₹43,524.50 in June, 2011 and ₹48,939.50 in March, 2012, the trial court has allowed ₹12,000/- as maintenance to wife and ₹4,000/- to the daughter. Learned counsel for petitioner has confined his submission only to the extent that enhanced maintenance, on the application under Section 127 Cr.P.C. has been allowed from the date of application instead of from the date of order. He submits that in the year 2010, salary of petitioner was quite less as such he was not in a position to pay ₹16,000/- per month from that date.

The above submissions of learned counsel for petitioner has no merits as in the year 2010, the gross salary of petitioner must be around ₹40,000/- and with the passage of time his salary is increasing and has jumped a lot with the latest revision in the salary of bank employee. The allowing of ₹12,000/- for wife and ₹4000/- for the daughter require no interference at this stage.

This petition has no merits and is dismissed.

(Surinder Gupta)
Judge

August 04, 2015
deepak