

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.3141 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision:04.05.2016

Kavita Rani

... Petitioner

Vs.

Ashok Kumar

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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

Present:- Ms. Seema Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

Petitioner-wife is aggrieved of the impugned order dated 19.04.2016, whereby, maintenance pendente lite is sought to be enhanced. In other words, maintenance pendent lite is too meagre.

Ms. Seema Arora, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-wife submits that husband is earning about ₹60,000/- per month and the Court below awarded maintenance pendent lite at the rate of ₹3,500/- per month and as well as, ₹2000/- as litigation expenses.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-wife and appraised the paper book and of the view that till adjudication of the application, no complete evidence has been placed on record to

show income of the respondent-husband as stated in the application. Even aforementioned income of ₹60,000/- per month has not been supported by any documentary evidence, whereas, on the contrary, respondent-husband has denied the same by stating that he has completed the course in Hotel Management and he is jobless. By taking into consideration that he is earning ₹9,000/- per month, maintenance pendent lite at the rate of ₹3,500/- per month awarded by the Court below is perfect and justified and will not preclude to seek enhancement as and when certain documents regarding the income of husband are produced.

With the aforementioned observations, the impugned order is affirmed and the revision petition stands dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

May 04, 2016
savita