

CR No.8033 of 2016 (O&M)

{1}

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CR No.8033 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision:30.11.2016

Jitender

... Petitioner

Vs.

Kavita

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Jai Singh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

Petitioner-husband is aggrieved of the impugned order dated 22.09.2016 (Annexure P-5), whereby, ad interim maintenance @ ₹5,000/- per month has ordered in a petition seeking divorce.

Mr. Jai Singh Yadav, learned counsel for the petitioner-husband submits that awarding of maintenance pendent lite is too phenomenal as the petitioner is doing nothing, therefore, the compensation should have been assessed on the basis of daily wager which could not be more than ₹3,500/-.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-husband and appraised the paper book and of the view that ad interim maintenance granted by the Court below is perfectly legal and justified on the basis of the affidavit filed before the Court below. The status of the parties have been taken care of.

In view of the aforementioned observations, I do not find any
illegality and perversity in the impugned order, much less the same cannot
be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

Accordingly, the revision petition stands dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

November 30, 2016
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No