

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

Date of Decision :23.02.2015

1. CRR(F) No. 96 of 2013(O&M)

Charan Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

Geeta

..... Respondent

2. CRR(F) No. 132 of 2013(O&M)

Geeta

.....Petitioner

Versus

Charan Singh

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr.S.K.Tripathi, Advocate
for Charan Singh.

Mr.Ashit Malik, Advocate for Geeta.

- 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)

These are two revisions. CRR(F) No. 96 of 2013 has been filed

by the husband against the award of Rs. 10,000/- per month as maintenance to wife Geeta and CRR(F) 132 of 2013 has been filed by the wife for enhancement of the said compensation amount.

Learned counsel for the husband has argued that marriage of the parties was solemnised on 01.12.2009 and the wife willingly withdrew the society of the husband without any sufficient cause and rather the husband has filed a petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act for restitution of conjugal rights. He has argued that the Family Court has erred in awarding Rs. 10,000/- per month as maintenance because the husband is not doing any job and is a student of MBA. On the other hand learned counsel for the wife (Geeta) has argued that the parents of Geeta spent an amount of Rs. 27 lacs on her marriage. From the very first day of the marriage the parents of Charan Singh-husband were not satisfied with the dowry and demanded more dowry and when she showed her inability to fulfil their demands, they started beating, harassing, humiliating and maltreating her. He has further argued that Charan Singh was earning an amount of Rs. 1 lac per month from the photostat shop which he was running in Sector 11, Noida and was also having a rental income of Rs. 50,000/- per month. Therefore, she is entitled to maintenance as per the status of her husband and that is why the amount of Rs. 10,000/- per month fixed by the Family Court is highly inadequate and the same should be

enhanced in view of status of both the families.

I have heard the submissions made by both the learned counsel and have perused the impugned order. I am of the view that all these points were duly raised before the Family Court also and after considering the same the amount of maintenance to the tune of Rs. 10,000/- has been awarded by it. I do not think that there is any scope for interference by this Court.

Resultantly both the petitions are dismissed.

**(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE**

February 23 , 2015
sunita