

Civil Revision No.1522 of 2016

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

Civil Revision No.1522 of 2016

Date of decision: 27.02.2016

Roop Chand

....Petitioner

Versus

Sheela Devi

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH DHALIWAL

- 1) Whether Reporters of the 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 ?

Present: - Ms. Sunita Punia, Advocate, for the petitioner.

PARAMJEET SINGH DHALIWAL, J. (ORAL)

The instant revision petition has been filed for quashing the order dated 05.01.2016 passed by learned Additional District Judge, Ferozepur, whereby respondent has been granted ₹ 8,000/- per month as maintenance pendente lite and ₹ 2,000/- as litigation expenses.

Brief facts of the case are that the petitioner filed a petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short 'the Act') for grant of decree of divorce against the respondent. Thereafter, respondent filed an application under Section 24 of the Act for grant of maintenance pendente lite and litigation expenses. Vide order dated 05.01.2016, learned Additional District Judge, Ferozepur, granted ₹ 8,000/- per month as maintenance pendente lite and ₹ 2,000/- as litigation expenses to the respondent. Hence, this revision petition.

Civil Revision No.1522 of 2016

Learned counsel for the petitioner vehemently contended that maintenance pendente lite granted by the learned Court below is on the higher side as the petitioner is a class four employee. Moreover, respondent is not entitled for any maintenance as she is living separately for the last 28 years.

I have considered the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner.

There is no force in the contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner. It is the duty of a husband to maintain her wife so that she is not left in the lap of vagrancy and destitution. Petitioner himself has admitted that he is a Government employee and drawing a salary of ₹ 28,000/- per month. ₹ 8,000/- granted to the respondent as maintenance pendente lite cannot in any terms be said to be on the higher side.

I do not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order.

Dismissed in limine.

(Paramjeet Singh Dhaliwal)
Judge

February 27, 2016
R.S.