

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

Civil Revision No. 171 of 2016

Date of Decision: 13.1.2016

Amandeep Sharma

---Petitioner

versus

Vijay Laxmi @ Amisha

---Respondent

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

Present: Mr. G.S.Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner

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

Rekha Mittal, J.

The present petition lays challenge to order dated 20.10.2015 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Bathinda whereby the petitioner has been directed to pay maintenance pendente lite at the rate of Rs. 6000/- per month and litigation expenses to the tune of Rs. 10,000/- while disposing of an application for maintenance filed under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (in short "the Act") by the respondent wife in the proceedings for divorce initiated under Section 13 of the Act by the petitioner husband.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that maintenance assessed by the trial court is on higher side and liable to be reduced particularly in

the circumstances that the minor child of the parties is residing with the petitioner.

I have heard counsel for the petitioner, perused the impugned order and find no reason to intervene.

Counsel for the petitioner is not in a position to assail the findings of the trial court that the petitioner lodged FIR No. 11 dated 28.1.2011 wherein he made a categorical averment that he is running a medical shop under the name and style of Guru Nanak Medical Store, Jai Singh Wala, Bathinda. The learned trial court has allowed maintenance at the rate of Rs. 6000/- per month which may not be sufficient to satisfy the daily needs of the respondent what to talk of comforts and luxuries. In this view of the matter, I do not find any merit in the submissions of the petitioner that maintenance assessed by the trial court requires to be reduced.

For the reasons aforesaid, finding no merit, the petition is dismissed in limine. No order as to costs.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

13.1.2016
PARAMJIT