

\$~6

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **MAT.APP.(F.C.) 15/2017**

NAVEEN KUMAR

..... Appellant

Represented by: Mr.K.D.Saini, Advocate.

versus

SUMAN

..... Respondent

Represented by: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YOGESH KHANNA

ORDER

%

03.02.2017

CM No.4273/2017

Allowed subject to just exceptions.

CM No.4275/2017

For the reasons stated in the application four days in filing appeal condoned.

MAT.APP.(F.C.) 15/2017

1. We find no merits in the appeal for the reason noting the appellant is earning ₹8,800/- per month, maintenance awarded to the wife is in sum of ₹3,500/- per month. She is maintaining a minor child.
2. Contention of the appellant that the respondent is working is noted and rejected by us for the reason in the reply to the application filed by the wife

under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, it has not been pleaded that the wife is working.

3. The appeal is dismissed in limine.

4. No cost.

CM No.4274/2017

Dismissed as infructuous.

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J

YOGESH KHANNA, J

FEBRUARY 03, 2017

M