

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

**1. Crl. Revn. No. 1546 of 2016**

Manoj Kumar ....Petitioner

versus

Sunita ...Respondent

**2. Crl. Revn. No. 1547 of 2016**

Manoj Kumar ....Petitioner

versus

**Sunita ...Respondent**

**Date of decision : 04.07.2016**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI**

**Present: Mr. Manoj Makkar, Advocate  
for the petitioner in both petitions**

\*\*\*\*

**RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)**

**CRM No. 13233 of 2016**

For the reasons mentioned in the application, delay of 11 days  
in filing the present revision petition is condoned.

The application stands disposed of accordingly.

**CRR No. 1546 and 1547 of 2016**

This order of mine shall dispose of the above two petitions  
wherein prayer is for setting aside order dated 13.01.2016.

The marriage of the petitioner was solemnized with the

complainant on 14.11.2011 as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. The respondent left her matrimonial house and thereafter, filed a petition under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 as amended up to date. The learned trial Court vide its order dated 11.06.2015 directed the petitioner to pay an interim maintenance of Rs.5000/- per month to the respondent-wife from the date of filing till disposal of the case along with litigation expense of Rs.3000/- with a further direction to make arrangement for the residence of the respondent-wife either in matrimonial home or in a suitable rental accommodation of status equivalent to that enjoyed by her in her matrimonial home.

Against the above said order, both petitioner and respondent filed their respective appeal and the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Rohtak partly allowed the appeal of the respondent-wife by enhancing the interim maintenance from Rs.5000/- to Rs.8000/- per month from the date of filing of the application and further observed that if accommodation is not proved to her in the matrimonial home, the petitioner shall pay Rs.3500/- per month w.e.f 11.06.2016. The appeal filed by the petitioner on the other hand was dismissed.

A perusal of order dated 13.01.2016 clearly shows that the petitioner has not led any evidence with regard to his salary, which he was getting from his department and in the absence of any evidence, the interim maintenance was awarded to the respondent by taking the salary of the petitioner to that of Sepoy in Indian Army @Rs.33000/- per month.

The finding recorded by the Courts below does not require any

interference by this Court.

The revision petitions stand dismissed.

04.07.2016

G Arora

**(RITU BAHRI)**  
**JUDGE**