

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 3274 of 2016

Date of decision : May 9, 2016

Maninderpal Singh Walia

..... Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Satinder Kaur

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. A. K. Chowdhary, 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 revision petition is against the impugned order dated 23.3.2016 whereby maintenance pendente lite to the tune of ₹7,000/- and litigation expenses to the tune of ₹10,000/- has been ordered.

It is conceded position on record that the petitioner is earning ₹30,000/- per month. The children are residing with the husband. The court below has arrived at a finding that the husband is a property dealer and also running a business of sale/purchase of Cars, maintenance at the rate of ₹7,000/- and litigation expenses at the rate of ₹10,000/-, in my view, is not phenomenal, for a person having such business.

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

May 9 , 2016
archana