

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

Sr. No.237

CR-6862-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: 22.02.2019

Ravinder Singh

....Petitioner

versus

Harpreet Kaur and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Ms. Promila Nain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Advocate
for the respondents.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The present petition is directed against the order dated 13.07.2017 passed by the Additional District Judge, Roopnagar (for short – the Trial Court) directing the petitioner-husband to pay to the respondent No.1-wife Rs.10,000/- per month and to respondent No.2-minor child of the parties Rs.8,000/- per month as interim maintenance.

The facts, in brief, which are required to be noticed for adjudicating upon the present petition are that in May 2014, the petitioner-husband filed a petition seeking therein divorce from the respondent -wife under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 (for short – the Act). During the pendency of such petition, the respondent-wife filed an application under Section 24 of the Act seeking therein interim maintenance for herself and also the minor child of the parties. In such application, the Trial Court issued directions to the petitioner-husband to pay Rs.10,000/- per month to respondent No.1-wife and Rs.8000/- per month to respondent No.2-minor child of the parties as interim maintenance. Rs.10,000/- as one

time litigation expenses were also awarded. Such order is under challenge in the present proceedings.

Learned counsel for the parties have been heard.

The petitioner's net income while working as a Territory Manager in NCR Private Limited, Chandigarh has been proven to be about Rs.85,000/- per month whereas the respondent-wife as a Lecturer in a private college is said to be earning about Rs.18,000/- per month. As it is admitted by learned counsel for the respondents that respondent No.1 is a Post Graduate in Science, the allegations made against her that she may be earning through private tuitions cannot be ruled out. In the light of the above facts grant of Rs.7,000/- per month to the respondent No.1-wife and Rs.8,000/- per month to respondent No.2-minor child of the parties is found to be just and adequate. However, Rs.10,000/- granted by the Trial Court as one time litigation expenses needs no interference.

Qua the present litigation, the respondent-wife is granted Rs.25,000/-.

The arrears are directed to be paid by the petitioner-husband within one month.

It is brought to the notice of this Court that the divorce petition was filed in May 2014 and is thus pending for nearly five years. Therefore, it is directed that the Trial Court shall dispose of the divorce petition expeditiously but not later than three months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

February 22, 2019

Jyoti 1

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No