

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

C.R. No.259 of 2016
Date of Decision.15.01.2016

Smt. Neetu

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Parmod

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Abhimanyu Batra, 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. The wife who is aggrieved about the inadequacy of maintenance granted is the revision petitioner before this Court. In a matrimonial proceeding where there was no evidence on either side about the income, the Court was only making an assumption that an able bodies person would be earning not less than ₹7,000/- per month and therefore, provided for ₹2500/- per month as maintenance for the wife and the child. The counsel says that an able bodied person in Haryana will not be earning less than ₹9000/- per month, I cannot make such assumption. I do not think that there is any error in granting the maintenance. However, It will be open for the petitioner to approach the same Court for modification of the provision for maintenance the way the trial Court did. if she is able to secure any better evidence as regards income status. If any effort is made by the wife to secure details of income from the employer of the respondent, the Court will assist the

petitioner to secure such information by exercising its discretion to summon the necessary records. As of now, there is no scope for interference.

2. The revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

January 15, 2016
Pankaj*