

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

CR No. 5308 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 11.8.2017

Sher Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Soma Rani

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Tara Chand Dhanwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against order dated 18.5.2017 passed by the learned matrimonial court, whereby application of respondent-wife under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, was allowed, husband-petitioner 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.

It is a matter of record that gross monthly salary of the petitioner is ₹48,000/-. Learned counsel for the petitioner has fairly conceded that carry home monthly salary of the petitioner is ₹35,786/-. If that is so, amount of ₹19,000/- per month, as maintenance to the respondent-wife who is also maintaining two children, cannot be said to be on higher side under any circumstances. The learned court below rightly observed in para 6 of the impugned order that if the petitioner finds it to be difficult to pay the amount of ₹19,000/- per month as maintenance for his wife and

children, he may curtail his expenses being incurred by him on his lavish lifestyle, so as to bring at par his wife as well as children so far as their lifestyles are concerned. During these days of sky rocketing prices, three persons cannot be expected to sustain themselves with any amount less than ₹19,000/-. Having said that, this court feels no hesitation to conclude 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. In fact, the impugned order has been found duly supported by sound reasons and the same deserves 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.

11.8.2017
AK Sharma

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

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