

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

C.R. No.3752 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision.27.05.2016

Rajneesh Singh Chaudhary

.....Petitioner

Vs.

Dr. Purnima Thapar

.....Respondents

Present: Mr. Ranjit Saini, 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 husband is before this Court complaining that ₹15,000/- ordered as maintenance for wife and son is excessive and it is far beyond his own means. It is seen from the salary certificate produced that his gross salary is ₹60,000/- and odd and after deduction, he is drawing a salary of ₹40,000/- plus. The employer has stated that he is paying ₹25,000/- to the parents as maintenance as per the Magistrate's order. I suspect that this is a self-inflicted order obtained by the petitioner willingly to stave off the claim for maintenance by the wife and child. There is no proof offered to me that there was a claim made by the parents against him and that the amount of ₹25,000/- which he has been directed to pay ought to be taken as reason for deduction out of his net salary. I must also observe that if a person shall be willing to pay ₹25,000/- to his parents, it is inconceivable as to why he will make a fuss about giving ₹15,000/- as maintenance to the wife and child. It is also argued by the counsel that the wife is doing post-doctoral work in the

I find from the information provided and available in the court records that the amount of what she has received pertains to the period March 2015 and the information available from the record shows that her continuance was assured upto 31.03.2015 only. I have nothing before me to show that there has any source of income for her beyond the said period. The counsel also contends that she has authored a book and she has been earning royalties. The book authored by her is priced ₹750/- and the author need not necessarily be earning royalties that can provide enough to support herself and her child unless there is proof of quantum of sales of the book from the publisher's sources. The amount of what is directed to be paid by the matrimonial court is modest for a person who has adequate resources and I will find no reason for making an interference.

2. The order already passed is sustained and the revision petition is dismissed.

(K. KANNAN)
JUDGE

May 27, 2016
Pankaj*