

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRR(F)-397-2020 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-27.11.2020

Naresh Kumar @ Vicky ... Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Preeti Rani and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioner.

(proceedings conducted through video conferencing)

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

1. The petitioner assails order dated 6.12.2019 vide which the Principal District Judge, Family Court, Hisar, while accepting a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. filed by the petitioner's wife Preeti Rani (respondent No.1) and his 3 children has been accepted and a monthly maintenance @ ₹20,000/- has been awarded.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that it is a case where respondent No.1 i.e. wife of the petitioner was herself highly qualified being LLB and MBA and is also into private practice and, as such, the maintenance as awarded by the Trial Court was on the higher side.
3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and have also perused the impugned order.

4. A perusal of the impugned order would show that the Trial Court has noticed all the contentions and the evidence led by the parties and has specifically recorded that there is nothing on record to prove that respondent No.1-Preeti Rani is earning sufficiently by practicing as a Lawyer. The Trial Court has also noticed that the petitioner-Naresh Kumar @ Vicky (husband) also have a pre-existing right on the agricultural land owned by his father. The factum of the petitioner getting a monthly salary of ₹44,183/- while working in 'M/s Mahindra & Mahindra Finance Company Limited' is not disputed. In these circumstances, it cannot be said that a total of ₹20,000/- per month as maintenance i.e. ₹10,000/- per month for respondent No.1 (wife) as well as ₹4,000/- per month for respondents No.2 and 3 each and ₹2,000/- per month for respondent No.3 is on the higher side. It is well settled that a husband is to maintain his wife and children as per the same standard which he would be enjoying.
5. Keeping in view the fact that the petitioners are four in number including the wife and three children, the monthly maintenance @ ₹20,000/- as awarded by the Trial Court certainly cannot be said to be on the higher side. The petition, as such, is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

27.11.2020

pankaj

**(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge**

Whether speaking /reasoned Yes / No

Whether Reportable Yes / No