

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND  
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

C.R. No.2438 of 2017

Date of Decision.16.01.2018

Ranjit Kaur

.....Petitioner

Vs

Manjit Singh

.....Respondent

**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL**

Present: Mr. Kanwar Pahul Singh, Advocate  
For the petitioner.

-.-

**AMIT RAWAL J.(ORAL)**

The petitioner-wife is in revision petition against the order dated 03.09.2016 passed in the application moved under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act in divorce petition filed under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act by the husband-Manjit Singh seeking divorce on the grounds stated therein.

Mr. Kanwar Pahul Singh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the maintenance was not claimed for herself but for the child, though there was no intimation made with regard to maintenance already being received from the Army authorities to the tune of Rs.4000/- per month but that would not be a ground for rejecting the maintenance to the child. The amount of Rs.6000/- per month granted by the trial Court is inadequate as she has to take care of minor child as well, thus, another amount of at least Rs.3000/- is required to be granted for maintaining the child.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and appraised the paper book. Though the respondent-husband has made a specific allegation that the petitioner is working as Helper in Guru Ram Dass Hospital and he is

already paying Rs.4000/- per month since September 2015 but the fact of the matter is that in the application, petitioner-wife failed to aver with regard to amount of Rs.4000/- being paid in view of her request made to the Army Authorities, as the husband is serving in Army. Keeping in view the fact that she has to take care of minor child, the trial Court has enhanced the amount of maintenance from Rs.4000/- to Rs.6000/-, as the husband is also maintaining the old parents. Therefore, I am of the view that the maintenance awarded is fair and just.

In view of the aforementioned, I do not find any reason to interfere with the order passed by the trial Court as the same cannot be said to be passed without jurisdiction or by exceeding its jurisdiction.

The revision petition is dismissed. However, the trial Court is expected to conclude the trial and dispose of the divorce petition as expeditiously as possible.

(AMIT RAWAL)  
JUDGE

January 16, 2018  
Pankaj\*

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| Whether reasoned/speaking | Yes |
| Whether reportable        | No  |