

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CR No.9030 of 2017
Date of Decision:21.12.2017**

Pargat Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

Sukhjit Kaur

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr.Vikas Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J. (ORAL)

Husband-petitioner is in the revision petition against the order passed by the learned trial court, awarding maintenance *pendente lite* @ Rs.3500/- per month.

The learned trial court has examined the facts of the case and noticed that the petitioner-husband is a skilled driver, whereas respondent-wife is not earning anything.

In these circumstances, the Court has granted maintenance *pendente lite* @ Rs.3500/- per month.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner-husband is not earning anything. He has further submitted that the wife is staying in the house of the husband.

I have considered the submissions. However, I do not find any substance therein. The petitioner is an able bodied man. He is a skilled driver. It is the duty of the husband to maintain the wife. In these circumstances, merely because the petitioner now claims that he is not working, that would not absolve the petitioner from his liability.

The next submission of the learned counsel is that the wife is staying in the house which belongs to the petitioner. This may be one of the circumstances for determining the quantum of maintenance. In the present case, the court has only awarded Rs.3500/- per month towards maintenance *pendente lite*, which is the bare minimum requirement for sustenance.

Taking into consideration the aforesaid facts, there is no good ground to interfere with the impugned order passed by the court below.

Dismissed.

21.12.2017
mks

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No