

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

111

CRR(F)-23-2021 (O & M)

Date of Decision: January 29, 2021

GAURAV KASERA

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

ANITA KASERA AND ANOTHER

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL

Present: Mr.Gurpreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J (ORAL)

Heard through video conferencing.

The petitioner has challenged the order dated 25.09.2020 whereby he has been directed to pay a sum of ₹20,000/- per month to respondent No.1 (wife) and a sum of ₹10,000/- per month to respondent No.2 (son) as interim maintenance.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner came back from United Kingdom in the year 2018 and is unemployed since then. He is sustaining himself by giving tuitions to students. He also contends that the petitioner is ready to pay the maintenance of ₹10,000/- per month to his son but the maintenance of ₹20,000/- per month awarded to the wife is excessive and unreasonable as she herself is well-employed and working as a teacher in a private school at salary of ₹35,000/- per month.

Heard.

The petitioner is stated to be B.E. in I.T. He was working as a Consultant with Tata Consultancy Services Limited in London. It is apparent from the material on record that the petitioner was not forthcoming with regard to his current income. He had filed an affidavit stating his income to be

₹20,000/- per month but the monthly expenses which he is incurring are to the tune of ₹70,000/- per month. There is nothing on record to show that respondent No.1 is working as a teacher in the private school.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to the advertisement of the school and face-book status of respondent No.1 (Annexure P-4) and contends that she is employed in the private school. Even assuming that respondent No.1 is employed in a private school, the maintenance awarded by the Family Court cannot be said to be excessive in any manner especially when the petitioner is well qualified Engineer and was employed with Tata Consultancy Services Limited in London. Therefore, I do not find any merit in this petition which stands dismissed.

(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)
JUDGE

January 29, 2021
A.Kaundal

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