

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

120

CR No.744 of 2020

Date of decision : 25.02.2020.

Satya Parkash

Versus

... Petitioner

Ritu

.. Respondent

CORAM :HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present:- Mr. Parshotam Lal Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Anupinder Singh Grewal, J. (Oral)

The petitioner has impugned the order dated 07.01.2020 passed by the Family Court, Rewari whereby he has been directed to pay a sum of ₹10,000/- per month as maintenance to the respondent, who is his wife and ₹5,000/- per month to his minor daughter.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is out of job ever since his services were terminated on 24.07.2019. Therefore, the maintenance assessed vide the impugned order should be reduced.

Heard.

This Court on 03.02.2020 had directed the petitioner to file an affidavit setting out the details of the movable and immovable properties owned by him and his family members. He was also required to mention therein his educational qualification and the details of the jobs he had held so far including the salary which he was drawing. The copies of the bank statements of the accounts being maintained by him were also sought by this Court.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner is unwell, therefore, he could not file the aforementioned affidavit.

It is manifest from the material on record that the petitioner was working as Assistant Manager with Flowmore Company Udyog Vihar, Phase-3, Gurugram and as per evidence of PW-3 Jitender Kumar, Admin. Manager, Flowmore Ltd., the petitioner was drawing a salary of ₹43,870/-per month. He had proved the salary slips Ex.PW3/B to Ex.PW3/D from November, 2017 to January, 2018. The petitioner is a B.Tech. and it was stated by the respondent in the petition for maintenance that he also owns agricultural land. The daughter of the petitioner was also stated to be unwell and the record of her treatment had been produced as Ex.R4 to Ex.R11. There is nothing on record to indicate that the services of the petitioner had been terminated on 24.07.2019. Learned counsel contends that after his evidence had been closed, his services were terminated. Even assuming that the services of the petitioner had been terminated from the Company, he is well qualified and experienced and thus, could have obtained another job. In any event, he cannot escape from the liability of maintaining his wife and minor daughter.

In view of the aforementioned facts and circumstances, the maintenance to the tune of ₹10,000/- per month to the respondent/wife and ₹5,000/- to his minor daughter cannot be said to be excessive which would warrant interference while exercising revisional jurisdiction.

Consequently, the petition stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

February 25, 2020
sonia gugnani

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No