

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

C.R. No.3093 of 2016

Date of Decision.09.05.2016

Naveen Kumar

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Savita Devi

.....Respondent

Present: Mr. Jagtar Kureel, 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 revision petition is against the order directing interim maintenance of ₹5000/- to be paid to the wife. The contention is that two of the children are residing with the husband-petitioner and he is spending ₹34,000/-. According to him, if a direction for payment of ₹5000/- is to be complied with, it will have an immediate bearing on the resources to the children being withdrawn.

2. The petitioner would do well to cut down his own needs and make possible ₹5000/- to be paid to the wife. If it would cause ₹34,000/- to be spent on himself and for two children, it should be only appropriate that he spends 1/5th amount towards wife. There is simply no justification for arriving to this Court to complain about assessment of maintenance granted.

2. The counsel for the petitioner says that if the matter is referred to mediation, it will yield to appropriate fruits. The petitioner may apply all his resources and inform the trial Court that he will try to

end the issue settling the matter. Any plea for settlement will be entertained at the foremost by the court below. The order passed by the Court below is maintained and the petition is dismissed but with the above observations.

**(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE**

May 09, 2016
Pankaj*