

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.1309 of 2017

Date of decision: 22.02.2017

Baljinder Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

Jaspreet Kaur

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. R.V.S. Chugh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (ORAL)

Present revision petition is directed against the order dated 17.12.2016 (Annexure P-5) passed by the learned District Judge, whereby the application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short 'the Act') filed by the respondent-wife was allowed, directing the petitioner-husband to pay an amount of Rs.3,000/- per month as maintenance pendente lite and one time litigation expenses of Rs.5,000/-.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

It has gone undisputed before this Court that respondent-wife, along with her minor child, is living with her parents. Petitioner-husband was not paying any amount of maintenance either for the respondent-wife or for the minor child. During pendency of the divorce petition, respondent-wife moved an application under Section 24 of the Act, which was allowed by the learned District Judge vide impugned order, directing the petitioner-husband to pay an amount of Rs.3,000/- per month. No separate amount was ordered to be paid for

the minor child. It is neither pleaded nor argued case on behalf of the petitioner that he had been paying any amount of maintenance either for the respondent-wife or for the minor child, in compliance of any other order passed by the learned Court of competent jurisdiction or on his own. Since the impugned order has not been found suffering from any patent illegality or perversity, the same deserves to be upheld.

In these days of sky-rocketing prices, no lesser amount can be imagined to be reasonable, than Rs.3,000/- per month and that too for two persons. Learned counsel for the petitioner failed to point out any patent illegality or perversity in the impugned order, which may warrant interference at the hands of this Court, while exercising its revisional jurisdiction.

No other argument was raised.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned, this Court is of the considered view that the present revision petition is wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No case for interference has been made out.

Resultantly, with the abovesaid observations made, instant revision petition stands dismissed, however, with no order as to costs.

[RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK]
JUDGE

22.02.2017
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No