

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

CRR(F)-290-2016

Date of Decision:- 05.10.2016

Naveen

....Petitioner

Versus

Rinku and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

**Present: Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)

Present revision petition is against the order dated 15.07.2016 passed by the learned District Judge (Family Court) Bhiwani whereby the petitioner has been directed to pay a sum of ₹5,000/- per month to Rinku-respondent No.1 (wife) and ₹1,000/- per month to Kanchan-respondent No.2 (daughter) as maintenance.

The case set up by the respondent (wife) is that she was thrown out of the matrimonial home by the petitioner (husband) and she has no source of income. She has also no movable and immovable property in her name. Her husband is working at Delhi Airport, besides the same he has also owned 2½ acre of agricultural land and his earning is ₹1,00,000/- per

month. Thus, she is legally entitled to interim maintenance.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has no source of income and he is not in a position to pay any maintenance amount as he is only working as a labor. So, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, going through the record, this Court is of the considered view that the learned District Judge (Family Court) Bhiwani, has rightly granted the maintenance of ₹5,000/- per month to respondent No.1 (wife) and ₹1,000/- per month to respondent No.2 (daughter), vide order dated 15.07.2016 and the same has been passed after appreciating the evidence in the correct prospective and does not require any interference. Such order, containing valid reasons, cannot possibly be interfered with by this Court, in exercise of limited revisional jurisdiction of this Court under Section 401 Cr.P.C., unless and until, the same is illegal, perverse and without jurisdiction. Since, no such patent illegality or legal infirmity has been pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, so, the impugned order deserves to be and is hereby maintained in the obtaining circumstances of the case.

In the light of aforesaid reasons, as there is no merit, therefore, the instant revision petition is hereby dismissed as such.

October 05, 2016
naresh.k

(**RITU BAHRI**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	/No