

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

Amit Kumar  
2017.07.04 10:24  
Assured the accuracy and  
integrity of this document

**CR No. 4160 of 2017 (O&M)**  
**Date of decision: 3.7.2017**

Jaswinder Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Amandeep Kaur and another

...Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Mandeep Singh Sodhi, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

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

Present revision petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, is directed against the order dated 22.12.2016 (Annexure P-6), whereby the learned trial court allowed the application of the respondent-wife and daughter of the parties, during pendency of the petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, granting an amount of ₹15,000/- per month for child and ₹5,000/- per month for the wife.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

A bare perusal of the impugned order would show that it is based on the statement suffered by the petitioner himself on 8.10.2015 before the learned court below to the effect that he was drawing monthly salary between ₹90,000/- to ₹95,000/-. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the petitioner could not point out any factual error in the impugned order in this regard. In this view of the undisputed fact situation obtaining on record, no fault can be found with the impugned order passed by the

learned trial court. It is so said because the learned trial court has granted even less than 1/4th of the monthly salary being drawn by the petitioner for the maintenance of his child and wife. Under these facts and circumstances of the case, the amount awarded to the respondents vide impugned order cannot be said to be on higher side by any stretch of imagination.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner has tried to make an improvement in the case of the petitioner contending that petitioner is serving in Merchant Navy but not on regular basis. However, no relevant material has been placed on record or shown to the court, so as to substantiate the abovesaid contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

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.

3.7.2017  
AK Sharma

**(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)**  
**JUDGE**

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether Speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable        | : | Yes/No |