

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

CRR(F)-405-2017 (O&M).

Date of Decision: 20.11.2017.

Deepak Sharma

... Petitioner

Versus

Anuradha Sharma and another

... Respondents

CORAM : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jitendra Chauhan

Present : Mr. Pritam Singh Saini, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN.J.

This revision is directed against the judgment dated 09.08.2017, passed by District Judge, Family Court, Gurugram vide which the petitioner was directed to pay maintenance allowance of Rs.10,000/- per month to respondent No.1-wife from the date of filing the petition and Rs.10,000/- per month to respondent No.2-minor son of the petitioner from the date of order. The petitioner was also directed to pay litigation costs of Rs.75,00/- to the respondents.

It is contended that the amount of maintenance is on the higher side and beyond the capacity of the petitioner. The petitioner was forced to leave his job with HDFC due to harassment at the hands of respondent No.1.

Heard.

After evaluating the evidence, the learned trial Court assessed the income of the petitioner at Rs.50,000/- while taking into consideration the income tax return for the year 2014-15 Ex.P-1 to P-3.

The minor child is a school going boy, therefore, keeping in view his admission, school fee and books expenses, the trial Court awarded a sum of Rs.10,000/- to each of the respondents. Taking into consideration the price index prevailing as on date and particularly the expenses for food, clothing, medicines, accommodation charges, this Court feels that the amount is not on the higher side. The documents on record indicate that the petitioner is a resourceful person. The Court feels that in view of the income as made out from the income tax returns Ex.P-1 to P-3, the amount awarded towards the maintenance is just and not on higher side.

Dismissed.

20.11.2017.
SN

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No