

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (227) No.867 of 2017**

Naresh Dhuppar S/o Shri Madanlal Dhuppar, Aged About 54 Years
R/o Bhumi Engineering L 200/1/2, G. I. D. C. Sachin Surat District
Surat, Gujrat.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. Aneeta Saluja D/o Lat Shri Harvansh Lal, Aged About 53 Years
R/o Shivaji Marg Jethwa Gali, Near Ambe Apartments,
Tikrapara, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Isha Dhuppar, D/o Shri Naresh Dhuppar, Aged About 26 Years
R/o Shivaji Marg, Jethwa Gali, Near Ambe Apartments,
Tikrapara, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr. Mateen Siddiqui and Ms. Shruti Pandey,
Advocates

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal
Order On Board

24/11/2017

(1) By the impugned order dated 02.06.2017 the Additional Principal Judge Family Court, Bilaspur has granted interim maintenance amount to the extent of Rs.6,000/- per month to the respondents, against which this writ petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India has been filed by the petitioner.

(2) Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the impugned order is unsustainable and bad in law as the interim maintenance amount as awarded to the respondents is shockingly

high and, therefore, it deserves to be reduced. He would further submit that the petitioner's objection regarding territorial jurisdiction is pending consideration before the Family Court, Bilaspur till now.

(3) I have heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

(4) After hearing learned counsel for the petitioner and taking into consideration the interim maintenance amount as awarded by the Family Court, Bilaspur to the extent of Rs.6,000/- per month to the respondents is just, proper and reasonable and cannot be said to be shockingly high warranting interference by this Court. However, the Family Court, Bilaspur is directed to consider and decide the petitioner's objection regarding territorial jurisdiction expeditiously before further proceeding with the matter as directed by this Court.

(5) Consequently, the writ petition deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

L