

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

**Crl. Revn. No. F-33 of 2013
Date of decision : 03.02.2017**

Parmilla	versus	Petitioner
Naveen		...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. Namit Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner.
Mr. Vikas Lochav, Advocate, for the respondent.

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of order dated 30.01.2013 passed by learned District Judge (Family Court), Sonapat vide which an amount of Rs.2200/- per month and Rs. 1100/- per month has been awarded to the petitioner and her son respectively in an application under Section 125 Cr.P.C.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the material evidence led by the petitioner regarding income of the respondent has not been properly appreciated while passing the impugned order as petitioner in her evidence by way of affidavit has clearly stated that the agricultural income is Rs.1,80,000/- per annum and in addition to it, the respondent is earning Rs.6000/- per month by doing a private job being a diploma holder from ITI. No rebuttal evidence has been adduced by the respondent to the contrary.

Heard.

The interim maintenance granted by the learned Court is liable to be modified, in view of the Haryana Government notification of minimum wage where the minimum wages for skilled labourer in July, 2013 is about

Rs.6500/- and further the respondent is having ownership of 06 acre of land and is diploma holder from ITI.

Keeping in view the fact, the impugned order dated 30.01.2013 is set aside and the petition is allowed and the respondent is directed to pay maintenance @ Rs.5000/- each per month to the petitioner and her son i.e Rs.10000/- in total per month from the date of passing of this order.

03.02.2017
G Arora

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>