

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CR No.1878 of 2017

Date of decision: 17.03.2017

Mandeep Kaur

... Petitioner

Vs.

Sarabjit Singh

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate and
Ms. Kamlesh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (ORAL)

Present revision petition, at the hands of wife, is directed against the order dated 31.01.2017 passed by the learned matrimonial Court, thereby allowing the application of the petitioner under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short 'the Act'), during pendency of the divorce petition under Section 13 of the Act, granting her an amount of Rs.3,500/- per month along with Rs.7,500/- as one time litigation expenses.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

It has gone undisputed before this Court that respondent-husband is not having any regular source of income. He had been doing the work of labourer. He hardly owns any landed property. In such a situation, petitioner cannot expect the respondent-husband to pay her exorbitant amount enabling her to support lavish life. Once the respondent-husband himself is almost hand

to mouth, the amount of Rs.3,500/- per month is well justified and it will meet the ends of justice. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the learned matrimonial Court did not commit any error of law, while passing the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner could not 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 under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. In fact, the learned Additional District Judge was well within his jurisdiction, while passing the impugned order, which has been found duly supported by sound reasons and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

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 present revision petition is wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, thus, it must fail. No ground 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

17.03.2017

vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No