

256

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

CRM-M-15986 of 2016

Date of decision: May 08, 2017

Hafiz Sharif Ahmed

.....Petitioner

Versus

Shamin

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present: Mr. Jai Bhagwan, Advocate for the petitioner.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Revisional Court vide order dated 12.01.2016 has reduced maintenance to the petitioner-father bringing it down to ₹2,000/- per month. Following are the reasons given by the revisional Court in Paras 9 and 10 of its judgment:-

“9. In the cross examination of applicant, it has come on file that applicant/respondent was earlier doing the business of property dealer and he is having some property in his name also. No source of income of respondent in the shape of document has been brought on file. Respondent/revisionist is having his wife and two daughters to maintain. Assessment of income at the rate of Rs.10,000/- per month without any document and settled business can be said to be on some higher side. Even otherwise, even if the income of revisionist/respondent to the tune of Rs.10,000/- per month is taken as true, respondent, including himself has four family members i.e. his wife and two minor children to maintain. He has to

maintain his daughters, put them in a school and has to fulfill their daily needs. Respondent-applicant being man, still can do something in order to fulfill his petty needs as it is established on file that he was working as property dealer earlier. In the given circumstances maintenance at the rate of Rs.3500/- per month is clearly at higher side.

10. Maintenance was required to be awarded at the rate of Rs.2,000/- per month and not at the rate of Rs.3500/- per month.”

Concurring with the above reasons given by the revisional Court, the present CRM-M-15986 of 2016 is summarily rejected.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

May 08, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No