

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

CRR(F) No.308 of 2015

Date of decision: 20th November, 2015

Jaipal

... Petitioner

Versus

Suman

... 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. Sandeep Goyat, Advocate
for the petitioner.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

The revision petitioner, husband Jaipal has sought to lay challenge to orders dated 19.10.2015 passed in a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. by the learned District Judge (Family Court), Bhiwani granting permanent maintenance of ₹4,000 per month to the wife Suman.

Upon hearing Mr. Sandeep Goyat, Advocate on behalf of the petitioner. It is duly proved that the couple entered into a wedlock on 03.03.2009 and due to matrimonial dispute, the wife was turned out of her matrimonial home on 17.05.2014. Though, learned counsel for the petitioner has sought to refute the earnings but as is reflected from the impugned findings and is well writ large on the record, the husband admits that he is an agriculturist though the wife claims that

he is earning ₹30,000 per month which has been denied by the husband. Copy of jamabandi regarding the agricultural land Ex.P1 pertaining to the year 2008-09 has been well considered by the trial Court. Though even the husband by way of jamabandi of the subsequent period Ex.R1/R2 pertaining to the year 2013-14 has sought to play down the total extent of the land, however, having regard to the fact that wife is young, aged at the time of filing of the application around 22 years and the fact that after she has been turned out of the house she has to make her own ends meet, needs a dwelling unit and basic amenities of life including nutritious diet and thus, to the mind of this Court grant of ₹4,000 per month as maintenance, keeping in view the prevalent rising trend of prices of essential commodities, cannot by any means be termed to be excessive or on the higher side. Learned lower Court has correctly appreciated the evidence, oral as well as documentary, commensurate with the status of the parties and has come to a totally justifiable conclusion and nothing can be found fault with. The revision petition certainly is without merits and needs to be dismissed at the very threshold and thus, stands dismissed in limine.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

November 20, 2015

rps