

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRR(F)-28-2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 30.01.2017

Gurmeet

....Petitioner

Versus

Reeta Devi

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Ms. Supriya Garg, Advocate
for the petitioner.

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has filed the present revision petition against order dated 01.09.2015, passed by learned District Judge, Family Court, Pathankot, vide which the application of the respondent for interim maintenance was allowed and she has been granted ₹2500/- from the date of filing of the application i.e. 26.08.2014.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner has no source of income and he is not in a position to pay any maintenance amount as he is only working as a labor. Moreover, the Court below has not considered the evidence led by the petitioner and wrongly directed him to pay maintenance of ₹2,500/- per month to the respondent. So, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, going

through the impugned order, this Court is of the considered view that the

learned District Judge, Family Court, Pathankot, has rightly assessed the income of the petitioner and passed the impugned order. The plea of actual earning will be decided at the final stage of application filed under Section 125 Cr.P.C. No ground for interference in the present revision petition, at this stage, is made out and the same is hereby dismissed.

January 30, 2017
naresh.k

(RITU BAHRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No