

109.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR(F)-237-2019

Date of decision: 07.02.2020

SUKHDEV

... Petitioner

versus

SUMAN

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present: Mr. Kanhiya Soni, Advocate, for
Mr. Surender Singh Dalal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Petitioner-husband has filed the present revision petition impugning the order dated 24.01.2019 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Jind, whereby on an application filed by the respondent-wife under Section 125 Cr.P.C. for grant of interim maintenance, the learned Family Court, considering the fact that the petitioner is working as probationary officer in Vijaya Bank which has subsequently been merged into the Bank of Baroda, has awarded interim maintenance @ Rs.10,000/- per month.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the petitioner is drawing a salary of Rs.22,000/- per month and, therefore, the maintenance awarded to the respondent even if it is interim, is on higher side.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Apart from the fact that the impugned order was passed on

24.01.2019 and more than one year has passed, the main petition must be at

an advance stage of trial. The petitioner is admittedly working as probationary officer in a bank, the argument of counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is drawing Rs.22,000/-, cannot be accepted. Moreover, such evidence has to be produced by the petitioner before the Family Court so as to substantiate this argument that he is drawing Rs.22,000/- per month.

The maintenance being interim, no case for interference is made out.

Dismissed.

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

07.02.2020
sanjeev

Whether speaking/reasoned?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No