

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

124

2023:PHHC:100912

1. CR-358-2022(O&M)
Date of decision: 04.08.2023

VISHESH ARORA

..Petitioner

Versus

HARPREET RUPRA

..Respondent

2. CR-2776-2022

HARPREET RUPRA

..Petitioner

Versus

VISHESH ARORA

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

Present: Mr. S.S. Behl, Advocate
for the petitioner (in CR-358-2022)
for respondent (in CR-2776-2022).

Mr. D.S. Sobti, Advocate
for respondent (in CR-358-2022)
for petitioner (in CR-2776-2022).

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J(Oral)

1. These two cross revision petitions have been filed to assail the correctness of the amount of maintenance payable to the wife and a daughter. CR-358-2022 has been filed by the husband, whereas, CR-2776-2022 has been filed by the wife. The Family Court has directed the husband to pay maintenance at the rate of Rs.15,000/- per month to the wife and Rs.25,000/- per month to the daughter. The Court has assessed the income of the husband at the rate of Rs.75,000/- per month.

2. This Bench has heard the learned counsel representing the parties at length and with their able assistance perused the paperbook.

3. The learned counsel representing the husband contends that the Family Court has erred in assuming that the husband has a monthly income

of Rs.5,00,000/-. He submits that the Income Tax Return reflects annual income and not monthly income. He further submits that the husband is living in his parents house and is owner of a small office space in the commercial area. Therefore, he prays for reduction of the amount.

4. On the other hand, the learned counsel representing the wife contends that the Family Court has assessed the income of the husband at the rate of Rs.75,000/- per month because his Income Tax Return itself shows that he is reflecting income of Rs.6,00,000/- per year. He further contends that the husband drives a Toyota Fortuner (SUV) car and is a member of Oxen Gym and Spa besides being member of Photo Box Club.

5. This Court has considered the submissions.

6. It is not in dispute that the husband is a property broker in the city of Ludhiana, which is commercial hub of the State of Punjab. He is also driving a high end SUV car.

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, the amount assessed by the Family Court is neither excessive nor arbitrary. The wife and the child are required to be provided with the amenities which permit them to live with the same amenities and standards.

8. Hence, no ground to interfere is made out.

9. Dismissed.

10. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

August 04th, 2023

Ay

(ANIL KSHETARPAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No