

CR No. 5772 of 2017 (O&M)

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

CR No. 5772 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 29.8.2017

Gurpreet Singh Ranu

...Petitioner

Versus

Pamdeep Kaur Ranu

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

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

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK, J. (Oral)

Feeling aggrieved against order dated 3.5.2017 passed by the learned matrimonial court, whereby interim maintenance of ₹3,000/- per month was ordered to be paid to the respondent-wife whereas ₹4,000/- was ordered to be paid to the minor son of the parties, 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 not in dispute that petitioner-husband is a man of means and is having handsome income from his agriculture land. A bare perusal of the impugned order would show that it is just an interim arrangement. Further, an amount of ₹3,000/- awarded to the respondent-wife and an amount of ₹4,000/- awarded to the minor son of the parties cannot be said to be on higher side by any stretch of imagination. In this view of the matter, it can be safely concluded that the learned matrimonial court was well within

CR No. 5772 of 2017 (O&M)

its jurisdiction to pass the impugned order and the same deserves to be upheld.

In these days of sky rocketing prices, respondent-wife cannot be expected to sustain herself by any amount less than ₹3,000/-. Similarly, an amount of ₹4,000/- to school going child cannot be said to be on higher side. Petitioner has not expressed his inability to pay the abovesaid amount of interim maintenance. Petitioner is not going to pay the amount of maintenance to any strangers but to his own wife and son. Petitioner has no other financial liability. 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.

So far as chances of an amicable settlement between the parties as suggested by learned counsel for the petitioner, are concerned, it goes without saying that the moment petitioner makes such a prayer before the learned matrimonial court, the same shall be entertained and the matter shall be referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre available at the District Court, where the lis is going on between the parties. This Court has no doubt that in case both the parties would make a sincere effort to arrive at an amicable settlement, they will certainly get due assistance from the Mediation and Conciliation Centre at the District Court.

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.

CR No. 5772 of 2017 (O&M)

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.

29.8.2017
AK Sharma

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

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