

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA, CHANDIGARH

CR No. 8733 of 2015(O&M)
Date of decision : January 21, 2016

Didar Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

Harpal Kaur

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Sharma, 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 petitioner-husband is aggrieved of the order whereby maintenance *pendente lite* to the tune of ₹4000/- per month has been awarded to the wife from the date of application till the final disposal of the main case being his contribution for the maintenance of the minor child of the parties as both husband and wife are working as teachers.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that an identical relief has been sought in a proceeding under Section 125 Cr.P.C and he has an apprehension that the respondent may not seek higher amount once the maintenance *pendente lite* has been given.

The aforementioned contention would only be seen

as taken that the court dealing with the maintenance pendente lite is apprised of the pendency of application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. The court while dealing with the application under Section 125 Cr.P.C shall not take into consideration the order granting maintenance *pendente lite*.

With the aforementioned observation, 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

January 21 , 2016
archana