

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

Amit Kumar
2017.08.04 13:54
Verified the accuracy and
integrity of this document

CR No. 5080 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 2.8.2017

Hanumant Bhardwaj

...Petitioner

Versus

Anchal @ Archana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against the order dated 20.5.2017 (Annexure P-4), passed by the learned matrimonial court, allowing the application moved by the respondent-wife under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 thereby granting her an amount of ₹20,000/- per month as maintenance, petitioner-husband 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.

On having been asked by the court, learned counsel for the petitioner admitted that petitioner is spending about an amount of ₹2 lacs annually on each child. Both the children are in the custody of the petitioner-husband and he is spending on the education of the children. If that is so, no fault can be found with the impugned order passed by the learned matrimonial court, wherein an amount of ₹20,000/- per month has been granted to the wife as maintenance. Having said that, 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.

Standard of living of the family is one of the relevant considerations in matrimonial disputes like the present one. The learned matrimonial court has found that petitioner was earning handsome income and was enjoying high standard of living. Thus, keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, learned matrimonial court came to the just conclusion that an amount of ₹20,000/- per month as maintenance for the respondent-wife would be just and appropriate. Under these undisputed facts and circumstances of the case, it can be safely concluded that the learned matrimonial court 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. In fact, the impugned order has been found duly supported by sound reasons and the same deserve to be upheld.

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.

2.8.2017
AK Sharma

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

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