

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 1675 of 2016
Date of decision : March 3, 2016

Piyare Lal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Sushila Devi and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. J. P. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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?

Amit Rawal, J (oral).

The petitioner-husband is aggrieved of the order whereby in an application under Section 19 and 22 of Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956, maintenance to the tune of ₹1000/- per month to the wife and ₹500/- to the daughter from the date of application till the remarriage of the petitioner has been awarded.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the amount is too higher which is not based on evidence of record.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, appraised the paper book and of the view that there is no illegality and perversity in the order in determining the compensation @ ₹1500/- per month. No evidence has been lead to defray the payment of maintenance.

I do not find any illegality and perversity in the impugned order and the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

The revision petition is devoid of merits. Accordingly the same is dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

March 3 , 2016
archana