

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CR No.627 of 2018

Date of decision:23.03.2018

Tarlok Singh

... Petitioner

Vs.

Daljit Kaur

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present:- Mr. H.S.Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

AMIT RAWAL J. (Oral)

The petitioner-husband is aggrieved of the impugned order dated 11.10.2017 (Annexure P-7) passed by the Additional District Judge, Rupnagar, whereby, the application filed by the respondent-wife under Section 24 of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, was allowed and the petitioner was directed to pay interim maintenance to the respondent at the rate of ₹5,000/- per month and ₹10,000/- as litigation expenses.

Mr. H.S.Saini, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner-husband submits that petitioner is daily wager and earning ₹4,000/- per month and respondent-wife is having sufficient source of income as she is doing business of Dairy Farming as well as stitching work, therefore, maintenance pendente lite of ₹5,000/- is on the higher side. He, thus, urges this Court for setting aside the order under challenge.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner-husband and appraised the paper book.

The Court below had relied upon the jamabandi for the year 2012-13 which showed that petitioner is owner/co-sharer to the extent of 1/32 share in the khasra mentioned therein. There is also a girl child born out of their wedlock, who is living with respondent-wife. In my view, awarding of interim maintenance @ ₹5,000/- per month, in the present era is not on the higher side, much less perfectly legal and justified.

In view of what has been observed above, there is no illegality and perversity in the impugned order, much less the same cannot be said to have been passed without jurisdiction.

Accordingly, the revision petition stands dismissed.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

March 23, 2018
savita

Whether Speaking/Reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No