

\$~41

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.REV.P. 194/2019**

TAJINDER ARORA & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Harmeet Singh, Advocate with
petitioner No.1 in person

Versus

MANISH ARORA

..... Respondent

Through: Nemo.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

19.02.2019

%

Crl.M.A. 3720/2019

Delay of 33 days in re-filing the accompanying petition is
condoned for the reasons stated in the application.

Application is disposed of.

Crl.M.A. 3721/2019

Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.REV.P. 194/2019

Impugned order of 27th September, 2018 fixes maintenance of
₹14,000/- per month while noting that respondent-husband is working in
a hotel, which is owned by his mother and brother and is getting salary of
₹25,000/- per month.

Petitioner's counsel assails the impugned order on the ground that respondent-husband actually owns two restaurants and is not an employee and his monthly income is in lakhs and so, the maintenance fixed ought to be suitably enhanced.

Upon hearing and on perusal of impugned order, I find that the amount of interim maintenance granted by trial court to petitioners is sufficient. The aspect of respondent-husband owning two restaurants and earning in lakhs, is required to be considered at trial.

While refraining to interfere with the impugned order, this petition is disposed of, with clarification that any observation made in the impugned order shall have no reflection on the merits when the maintenance amount is actually determined after the parties have led the evidence.

With aforesaid observations, this petition is disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 19, 2019

r