

Amit Kumar  
2017.05.18 16:11  
Verified the accuracy and  
integrity of this document

**HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CR No. 3584 of 2017 (O&M)**  
**Date of decision: 17.5.2017**

Darshan Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Baljeet Kaur

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK**

Present: Mr. Jasbir Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

**RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)**

Feeling aggrieved against the order dated 16.3.2017 (Annexure P-3) passed by the learned matrimonial court, whereby an amount of ₹4,000/- per month has been awarded as maintenance pendente lite to the respondent-wife during the pendency of divorce petition filed by the petitioner, he has approached this Court by way of present revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for setting aside the impugned order.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

A bare perusal of the impugned order passed by the learned court below would show that it is a well reasoned order. Only an amount of ₹4,000/- per month as maintenance has been granted by way of impugned order, which will continue to operate during the pendency of the divorce petition filed by the petitioner-husband. Since the amount of ₹4,000/- per month as maintenance is very reasonable and cannot be said on higher side in these days of sky rocketing prices, by any stretch of imagination, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the learned matrimonial court was well within its jurisdiction to pass the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

As per allegations levelled by the respondent-wife, petitioner-husband runs a shop of photography and videography. Although he has denied that allegation, yet he did not point out, as to how much he is earning. In fact, petitioner is trying to back out from his responsibility of maintaining his wife, on one or the other excuse, which is not permissible in law. Under these peculiar facts and circumstances, it can be safely concluded that the learned court below committed no error of law, while passing the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

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.

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 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.

17.5.2017

AK Sharma

**(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)**

**JUDGE**

Whether Speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether Reportable : Yes/No