

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

CRR(F) No.588 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 21st November, 2018

Sanjiv Kumar

... Petitioner

Versus

Anita & another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Rakesh Sobti, Advocate for the petitioner.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

This is a revision against an order passed by the Court of learned District Judge, Additional Family Court, Hisar dated 23.08.2018 whereby petition of the wife Anita and minor daughter Bhavya alias Bhawna against respondent husband Sanjiv Kumar Bhardwaj (present petitioner) was allowed and the Court below has ordered maintenance at the rate of Rs.10,000/- to each of the two petitioners (total amounting to Rs.20,000/-) besides awarding Rs.5500/- as litigation expenses with the direction that the maintenance shall be deposited by first week of every month in the account of the petitioners and in case of default to pay additional sum of Rs.1,000/- to each of the petitioners for every default per month.

Upon hearing Mr. Rakesh Sobti, Advocate for the petitioner and on perusal of the records.

The inter-se relationship of the parties is not at all put to question either in the impugned findings or in the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner before this Court. The parties have a matrimonial history where the criminal cases too are pending inter-se between them. The daughter is a student of 9th class and the wife is not earning nor has any source of income.

It is the own stand of the husband in the submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner that he is employed as a driver in Municipal Corporation, Chandigarh and his salary certificate Ex.R7 shows his salary to be Rs.41,532/- per month. The submissions that he has to pay LIC installment or towards GPF etc. do not cut much ice as it is his salary which needs to be taken into consideration and it is not his case that he has other liabilities.

Keeping in view his admitted earnings, to the mind of this Court, award of Rs.10,000/- to each of the respondents is not on the higher side. Learned counsel for the petitioner could not convince this Court how there has been any illegality or perversity in the impugned findings or the amount so awarded is on the higher side. The revision is hopelessly meritless and stands dismissed in limine.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

November 21, 2018

rps

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No