

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

113

**CRR(F)-156-2022 (O&M)  
Decided on : 07.03.2022**

Paramjit Kaur

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

Paramjit Singh

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL**

**(Through Video Conferencing)**

PRESENT: Mr. K.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate  
for the petitioner(s).

\*\*\*\*

**MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral)**

The petitioner is impugning the order dated 24<sup>th</sup> November, 2021, passed by the learned Family Court at Amritsar, in case bearing No. MNT-125/10277/1216 of 2014/2019, dated 08.08.2019, wherein, application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. for grant of interim maintenance to the petitioner, was dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contended that the behaviour and conduct of the respondent-husband and his family from the very beginning of her marriage was cruel, as they were dissatisfied with the dowry given at the time of marriage. The respondent-husband shirked his matrimonial duties and also misappropriated the petitioner's dowry articles. Soon after her marriage, the mother of the petitioner met with an accident and thus she went to her parental house to look her up, however, thereafter, despite her earnest efforts, she was not allowed to return to her matrimonial home by the respondent-husband and his family. Learned counsel submitted that since the respondent-husband had sufficient means, as he was a serving defense personnel and earning a salary of approximately Rs. 60,000/- p.m. the Family Court gravely erred while passing the impugned order and declining her interim maintenance.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the relevant material on record.

A perusal of the impugned order comes across, as a well reasoned one, which does not suffer from any illegality or infirmity. The

submissions made by the learned counsel that it was on account of the petitioner's mother meeting with an accident that she left her matrimonial home after two days of marriage, is contrary to her version given before the Court below, wherein, she stated that she had been turned out from the matrimonial home after a demand of car was raised by the respondent. Still further, it is the admitted case of the petitioner that after the solemnization of her marriage with the respondent on 11.10.2010, she had returned to her parental home on 13.10.2010 i.e. 2 days after the marriage and even the divorce petition filed by the respondent-husband on 05<sup>th</sup> June, 2012 remained un-contested by the petitioner, as a result of which, the marriage between the parties, was dissolved by a decree of divorce vide judgment dated 01.08.2013. Undoubtedly, the respondent, solemnized a second marriage before filing an appeal before this Court, however, this Court after setting aside the *ex-parte* judgment vide which the marriage between the parties had been dissolved, remanded the case back to the trial Court, wherein, yet again divorce was granted to the respondent.

The petitioner has failed to show any sufficient cause for refusing to join the company of her husband or leaving his company, more so, when she had specifically admitted in her cross-examination that she had levelled false allegations of maltreatment and demand of dowry against the members of her in-laws at the behest of her parents.

Accordingly, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the instant revision petition stands dismissed.

**(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)**  
**JUDGE**

**March 07, 2022**

*J.Ram*

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