

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

**CRR(F) No.520 of 2018**

Date of decision: 10<sup>th</sup> October, 2018

Amardeep

... Petitioner

Versus

Meenu & another

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH**

Present: Mr. Ravinder Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner.

**FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.**

Through this invocation by way of revision under Section 401 Cr.P.C. petitioner Amardeep has sought to challenge the orders dated 02.08.2018 passed by the Court of learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Rohtak in an application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. for grant of interim maintenance allowance.

The wife Meenu and minor son Yuvraj of the petitioner had filed an application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. and the Court below considering the socio-economic affairs and status of the parties, awarded interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.10,000/- per month to the wife and Rs.5,000/- to the minor son from the date of filing of the application.

Upon hearing Mr. Ravinder Hooda, Advocate for the petitioner and on perusal of the records. It is not displaced by any means

that the husband petitioner is MBA qualified, earlier working in Bharti AXA Life Insurance Company and getting Rs.60,000/- per month as salary and thereafter left the job to work in another private undertaking. The main thrust of the arguments of learned counsel for the petitioner is that the wife is earning handsomely.

The Court below had given a well thought-out reasoning that the wife had come up bonafidely accepting that she was earlier working and earning Rs.7,000/- per month but she was no more employed and therefore, certainly to the mind of this Court, as has been held by the Court below the past income cannot be considered and it is the present status of the parties at the time of pendency of the application, the same needs to be taken into account. The husband is an able bodied, fully qualified person and therefore, is under legal obligation to maintain his dependent wife and minor child, and who are supposed to live commensurate with the economic status of the petitioner. Keeping in view that the child is school going and in view of the rising trend of prices of essential commodities, education, necessities of life and the market rentals, a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month to the wife and Rs.5,000/- per month to the child in this economic scenario is certainly a reasonable amount and cannot be termed to be on the higher side. This Court could not come across any illegality or perversity in the

impugned findings. The revision petition being hopelessly meritless,  
stands dismissed in limine.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)  
JUDGE

October 10, 2018  
*rps*

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