

247

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

**Civil Revision No.4925 of 2018
Date of Decision: 31.10.2018**

Harjinder Singh

.....Petitioner

Vs

Ranjeet Kaur

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Saurabh Bhadwaj, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Uppal, Advocate
for the respondent.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

[1]. This revision petition has been preferred by the petitioner against the order dated 08.02.2018 passed by the Addl. District Judge, Patiala vide which an amount of Rs.12,000/- per month as interim maintenance to the respondent and their child aged 7 years and Rs.3,000/- towards litigation expenses were awarded.

[2]. Concededly the salary of the petitioner is Rs.40,000/- per month. He is working as TGT (Punjabi) in Jawahar Navodya Vidyalaya Tarikhet, Tehsil Ranikhet, District Almorha, Uttarakhand. Respondent though is qualified having M.A. B.Ed. to her credit,

but she is not working anywhere.

[3]. There are allegations and counter allegations in respect of matrimonial controversy between the parties.

[4]. In pursuance of order dated 03.08.2018, both the parties have come present in Court. The Court has also interacted with the parties so as to strike some amicable resolution of the dispute. Petitioner is not inclined to keep the respondent owing to her alleged conduct. On the other hand, respondent is not willing to give her consent for parting ways subject to receiving any permanent alimony for such separation.

[5]. In view of aforesaid position, I deem it appropriate to decide the present revision petition on merits.

[6]. Admittedly, monthly salary of the petitioner is Rs.40,000/-. At this stage, there is no evidence of any other income derived by the petitioner from other sources. Respondent is not employed anywhere and the minor daughter is in custody of the respondent, who is studying in 2nd Class in Sant Inder Dass Public School, Patiala.

[7]. Award of Rs.12,000/- per month for the respondent as well as for the child as interim maintenance besides awarding an amount of Rs.3,000/- towards litigation expenses cannot be held to be on higher side as the amount is meant to prevent vagrancies and destitution of the respondent.

[8]. In view of aforesaid, there is no error of jurisdiction in the impugned order passed by the trial Court. This revision petition is accordingly dismissed.

October 31, 2018

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No