

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

Sr. No.119

**CRR(F) No.833 of 2019 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: October 22, 2019**

CHAND

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

POOJA AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

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

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has approached this Court challenging order dated 17.07.2019 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rohtak, whereby the trial Court while accepting petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. has awarded maintenance to respondent No.1 @ Rs.4000/- per month and to respondent No.2 @ Rs.3000/- per month while holding that an able bodied person is expected to at least a minimum wages as fixed by the State government.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that trial Court fell in error in assessing the aforesaid maintenance, which is on the higher side.

I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the impugned order.

CRR(F) No.833 of 2019 (O&M)

A perusal of the same shows that the trial Court after having reached at a finding that the respondent No.1 was the legally wedded wife of the petitioner and respondent No.2 was the minor son has proceeded to award maintenance as the petitioner was found to have neglected maintaining the respondents. This Court does not find any infirmity in the said findings. The amount of maintenance as assessed by the trial Court as Rs.4000/- per month to respondent No.1 and Rs.3000/- per month to respondent No.2 cannot, any stretch of imagination, be said to be unreasonable or on the higher side as even an unskilled labourer is expected to earn anything above Rs.15,000/- per month.

Finding no merit in the petition, the same is dismissed.

October 22, 2019

Ankur

**(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No