

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

109

**Civil Revision No.5719 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 06th December, 2022**

Kailash

...Revisionist-Petitioner

Versus

Smt. Krishna

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA

Present :- Mr. Armaan Gagneja, Advocate,
for the revisionist-petitioner.

* * * *

MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA, J.(ORAL)

By way of the instant revision petition, the petitioner has assailed the order dated 20.08.2022 (Annexure P-5) passed by learned Principal Judge (Family Court), Bhiwani, (for short 'the trial Court'), whereby the application moved by the respondent-wife (here-in-after to be referred as 'the wife') under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, has been allowed and the petitioner-husband (here-in-after to be referred as 'the husband') has been directed to pay a sum of Rs.7,500/- per month to the wife as the *pendente-lite* maintenance allowance from the date of the filing of the application till the decision of the main divorce petition and Rs.7,000/- as the litigation expenses.

2. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner-husband in this petition, at the preliminary stage and have also perused the file carefully.

3. It is worth-while to mention here that at the very outset, learned counsel for the husband has restricted the challenge to the impugned order to

the extent of the quantum of the maintenance allowance only and he contends that the husband earns meagre income as an Electrician whereas the wife herself is earning income of Rs.20,000/- per month by doing the tailoring work and hence, the amount of maintenance allowance, as directed by the trial Court to be paid to the wife, is on the higher side and deserves to be reduced.

4. However, the afore-raised contention is devoid of any force because at this stage, the husband has not placed any document on the file to show that the wife is earning sufficient income for her livelihood. Moreover, throughout in this revision petition and Reply (Annexure P-4) to the said application, he (husband) has not come forward with any specific version qua his own income whereas as mentioned in Para No.6 in the impugned order, the wife has asserted that the husband is well educated and he runs a shop and also works as the Contractor and has been earning more than Rs.60,000/- per month. Keeping in view the ever-escalating price-index, the afore-said amount, granted by the trial Court to the wife as the *pendente-lite* maintenance allowance, cannot be construed to be unjustified or exorbitant at all.

6. In view the fore-going discussion, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order (Annexure P-5) does not suffer from any illegality, infirmity, irregularity or perversity so as to call for any interference by this Court. Resultantly, the revision petition in hand, being *sans* any merit, stands dismissed.

06.12.2022
Seema

(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)
JUDGE

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