

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

**C.R. No.6482 of 2016
Date of Decision.28.09.2016**

Vandana		Petitioner
	Vs.	
Shiv Darshan		Respondent

Present: Mr. Jawinder Singh Grewal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

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 counsel for the petitioner submits that despite awarding maintenance pendente lite @₹12,000/-, litigation expenses has been awarded only at ₹1100/-.

I am of the view that litigation expenses at ₹1100/- in the present time is too meagre. The order under challenge is modified viz-a-viz the litigation expenses and the same shall be construed as ₹11,000/- instead of ₹1100/-.

I do not intend to issue notice to the other side as it would entail into defraying of litigation expenses. In fact, the husband will have to spend more money for hiring the services of lawyer in case notice is issued. The order qua maintenance pendente lite is upheld.

The revision petition stands disposed of with the above modification.

**(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE**

September 28, 2016
Pankaj*

Whether reasoned/speaking	Yes/No
---------------------------	--------

Whether reportable	Yes/No
--------------------	--------