

117
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR-1152-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 20.2.2018

Vijay Kumar

..... Petitioner

Versus

Heena

..... Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Ms. Nikhar Baranwal, Advocate for
Mr. Jitender Singh Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

1. *Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *To be referred to the Reporter or not.*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?*

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

Heard.

Impugned in the present revision petition is the order dated 16.12.2017, passed by learned Additional District Judge, Ludhiana vide which in an application filed by Heena-respondent/wife was allowed granting her Rs. 4000/- per month as maintenance pendente lite.

Keeping in view the present level of prices of essential commodities, I am of the view that Rs. 4000/- per month as maintenance pendente lite to the wife is inadequate.

There is no ground to reduce the said amount of maintenance pendente lite awarded vide order dated 16.12.2017 by learned Additional District Judge, Ludhiana.

Dismissed.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

20.2.2018
preeti

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes
No