

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.1274 of 2016

Date of Decision.19.02.2016

Sita Devi @ Sita Verma

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Vijay B. Verma

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Ramdeep Partap Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

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

-.-

K. KANNAN J. (ORAL)

1. In a petition for maintenance which was reduced to ₹1 lac by the Supreme Court in proceedings taken by the husband for divorce, it was stated that the husband's petition was later withdrawn on compromise between the parties when the wife has prepared to settle for lesser sum than what was granted by the High Court. The wife has not satisfied with the undertakings given and she has moved a fresh petition for divorce against the husband and she has moved an application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act for maintenance at ₹5.5 lacs but the Court has awarded ₹1 lac. The wife is in revision against this order.

2. When the order was passed by this Court determining a maintenance of ₹1.5 lacs and when it was reduced to ₹1 lac by the Supreme Court, I do not think that there is scope for reconsideration of what would be appropriate maintenance to be given. If the trial Court

has provided for interim maintenance at ₹1 lac, I will find no scope for interference. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

February 19, 2016
Pankaj*