

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRR(F)-286-2016

Date of Decision:- 14.02.2017

Ankush Dhiman

....Petitioner

Versus

Sarita

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RITU BAHRI

Present: Mr. R.S. Mamli, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

RITU BAHRI, J. (Oral)

Petitioner has come in revision against order dated 04.06.2016 passed by learned District and Sessions Judge (Family Court), Sonapat, vide which the application of the respondent for maintenance was allowed and she has been granted ₹8,000/- from the date of filing of the application.

As is evident from the record that as per the respondent, the petitioner is running a school at Jagadhari and earning a sum of ₹70,000/- per month. On the other hand, as per petitioner, he is a lecturer in a reputed institute and earning ₹25,000/- per month. Consequently, after taking into consideration the evidence brought on record, the trial Court had granted maintenance of ₹8,000/- per month from the date of filing of the petition.

After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, going through the record, this Court is of the considered view that learned District

right perspective, recorded the cogent grounds and correctly passed the impugned order. Such order, containing valid reasons, cannot possibly be interfered with by this Court, in exercise of limited revisional jurisdiction of this Court under Sections 401 Cr.P.C., unless and until, the same is illegal, perverse and without jurisdiction. Since, no such patent illegality or legal infirmity has been pointed out by the learned counsel for the petitioner, so, the impugned order deserves to be and is hereby maintained in the obtaining circumstances of the case.

In the light of aforesaid reasons, as there is no merit, therefore, the instant revision petition is hereby dismissed as such.

February 14, 2017
naresh.k

(**RITU BAHRI**)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No