

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

CRR(F) No.143 of 2015

Date of decision: 14th July, 2015

Rupesh Tyagi

... Petitioner

Versus

Preety Tyagi

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

1. Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. Whether to be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present: Mr. Bikram Chaudhary, Advocate
for the petitioner.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

This will dispose off petition of the husband Rupesh Tyagi by way of revision against impugned orders dated 12.01.2015 passed by the learned District Judge, Family Court, Faridabad allowing application of the wife and awarding a sum of ₹14,000 per month as interim maintenance.

Heard Mr. Bikram Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner/husband.

It is the stand of the wife as is reflected from the impugned order that she was not having any income whereas the husband/present petitioner was working as an Engineer earning

₹50,000 per month, besides owning ancestral property consisting of agricultural land and other dwelling units. Claim of the husband that the wife was working as an Architect is not at all substantiated by any means. The parties are yet to lead evidence and at this juncture the Court is supposed to evaluate the relative statuses of the parties and there is a categorical finding that the wife at present has left her earlier job, whereas salary slip of the husband shows that he was earning ₹44,464 per month and there is no obligation of the husband proved on the record except wife.

It is settled law that the husband is supposed to maintain and upkeep his wife commensurate with his status. Learned lower Court in exercise of its judicial discretion has awarded this interim maintenance and learned counsel for the petitioner could not convince as to how the same was unjust, unreasonable or contrary to the interpretation of the stands of the parties and the records. Thus, finding no illegality or perversity in the same, the revision being without any merit stands dismissed in limine.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

July 14, 2015
rps