

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CR No.3958 of 2017  
Date of decision: 31.05.2017

Sonal Dua

... Petitioner

Vs.

Pooja

... Respondent

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

Present: Mr. Atul Nathalia, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

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

Feeling aggrieved against the order dated 20.02.2017 (Annexure P-1) passed by the learned matrimonial Court, granting an amount of Rs.2,000/- per month as maintenance pendente lite to the respondent-wife, husband has approached this Court by way of instant civil revision petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, for setting aside the impugned order.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

A perusal of the impugned order would show that only an amount of Rs.2,000/- per month has been granted to the respondent-wife, by allowing her application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, during pendency of the divorce petition filed by the petitioner-husband. The impugned order is just an interim order, which shall be co-terminus with the proceedings of the divorce petition. So far as the amount of Rs.2,000/- per month is concerned, it is the bare minimum amount, which would be required for sustenance of the respondent-

wife. Nothing could be more reasonable than Rs.2,000/- per month. Having said that, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the learned matrimonial Court committed no error of law, while passing the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has pointed out that the petitioner-husband is ready and willing to take home his wife-respondent. If that is so, nobody will come in his way, if the petitioner-husband is sincere in his efforts to settle the matter amicably. Let him approach and persuade his wife to come along with him, with a view to stay in the matrimonial home. Let the petitioner-husband assure his wife about her comfortable stay in her matrimonial home. Further, in case the petitioner needs any counselling or mediation, he would be at liberty to move the learned matrimonial Court in this regard. So far as the impugned order is concerned, it is based on sound reasons and no fault can be found with it, thus, the impugned order deserves to be upheld, for this reason also.

Under no circumstances, the impugned order can be said to be contrary to the facts or suffering from any patent illegality. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not point out any such illegality 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 impugned order is a self-contained and well justified order, which deserves to be upheld, for this reason as well.

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 since no illegality has been found in the impugned order passed by the

learned matrimonial Court, the same deserves to be upheld. The revision petition having been found wholly misconceived, bereft of merit and without any substance, must fail. No ground for interference has been made out.

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

**[ RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK ]**  
**JUDGE**

31.05.2017  
*vishnu*

|                           |        |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | Yes/No |