

\$~19

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

+ CRL.REV.P. 626/2016 & CrI.M.A.14705/2016 (Stay)

PRAHLAD SINGH Petitioner

Through: Mr.Chittranjan Hati, Adv.

versus

SEEMA SINGH & ANR Respondents

Through: Mr.Suresh Sharma, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORDER

%

16.08.2017

On a complaint lodged by the respondent No.1 under Section 12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, the Trial Court directed the petitioner to pay an amount of Rs.5000/- to the respondent No.1. The aforesaid order of the Trial Court was challenged under Section 29 of the Domestic Violence Act by the respondent No.1 vide CrI.Appeal No.8/2016.

The Appellate Court, taking into account the affidavit of the petitioner that his monthly salary is Rs.33,193/-, enhanced the quantum of compensation from Rs.5000/- per month to Rs.10,000/- per month.

The present revision petition challenges the aforesaid appellate order of the Court below.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that both the Courts below i.e. the Trial Court as well as the Appellate Court did not take into account the fact that after the filing of the affidavit regarding his monthly income,

the petitioner has resigned from his job and is jobless today.

The petitioner did not state before the Appellate Court as to what is the current position regarding his employment. It does not appear probable that a person who was employed in a private job would resign and would continue to remain jobless. There is no statement in the present petition which explains as to how the petitioner has been carrying on with his expenses which he needs to incur for living a life.

There is no reason for this Court to interfere with the order directing the petitioner to pay Rs.10,000/- per month to the respondent No.1.

The revision petition, therefore, is without merits and the same is dismissed.

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J

AUGUST 16, 2017

k