

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**CRR No.3570 of 2015 (O&M)****Date of Decision: September 23, 2015**

Gurjeet Singh @ Jeeta

...Petitioner

VERSUS

Jasbir Kaur @ Jassi and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE INDERJIT SINGHPresent: Mr.Dinesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

INDERJIT SINGH, J.

The present revision has been filed by the petitioner Gurjeet Singh @ Jeeta against respondents Jasbir Kaur @ Jassi and Jaspreet Singh, challenging the impugned judgment dated 28.07.2015 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge (III), Sangrur.

The brief facts of the case are that an application for interim maintenance was filed by Jasbir Kaur @ Jassi and Jaspreet Singh against Gurjeet Singh @ Jeeta and reply to that application was also filed. Learned JMJC, Sangrur granted interim maintenance of ₹1500/- per month to each of the applicant, totaling to ₹3000/- per month. Aggrieved from the above-said order, applicants (present respondents) filed revision petition and learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Sangrur vide impugned judgment dated 28.07.2015, enhanced the interim maintenance to ₹2500/- per month to each of the applicant,

totaling to ₹5000/-.

Aggrieved from the above-said impugned judgment, present revision petition has been filed.

I have heard learned counsel for the revision petitioner and have gone through the lower Court record.

From the record, I find that the applicant-respondent No.1 has stated that Gurjeet Singh @ Jeeta owns the landed property at village Dugal Kalan and also owns a Dhaba at village Dugal Kalan, Tehsil Samana. It is also the case of the applicant that present petitioner had given the Dhaba on lease to some other person and he is earning ₹2 lacs per annum whereas the applicant is unable to maintain herself and her minor child. It is also stated that the minor son is school going.

On the other hand, it is the case of the respondent (present petitioner) that Jora Singh is the owner of the Dhaba and present petitioner is working as a Manager/Munshi and getting salary of ₹4000/- per month only.

The Court after hearing learned counsel the parties and after going through the record, held that land measuring 32 kanals is owned by the mother of present petitioner. The Court, keeping in view the facts and circumstances and status of the family, held that respondent's (present petitioner) income cannot be less than ₹12,000/- per month and awarded ₹2500/- per month to each of the applicant, totaling to ₹5000/- per month. The Court further held that present petitioner is not a simple labourer nor he is earning ₹4000/-

per month. These reasonings are correct one and as per law. Even now-a-days, a labourer earns ₹8000-9000/- per month by doing manual labour. The version of the petitioner that he is Manager and earning ₹4000/- per month, cannot be believed, as it is not supported by any cogent document.

In view of the above discussion, I find that the impugned judgment dated 28.07.2015 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Sangrur, is correct, as per evidence, law and does not require any interference from this Court and the same is upheld.

Therefore, finding no merit in the present petition, the same is dismissed.

September 23, 2015
Vgulati

(INDERJIT SINGH)
JUDGE