

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

(222)

CR No. 8907 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision : 11.05.2023

Smt. Rashmi Bedi

...Petitioner

Versus

S. Sandeep Bedi

...Respondent

***CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI***

Present: Mr. Veneet Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

\*\*\*

**Harsimran Singh Sethi J. (Oral)**

1. The present civil revision petition has been filed for setting-aside the order dated 06.05.2015 (Annexure P-3) by which a sum of ₹6,000/- per month as a maintenance allowance has been allowed in favour of the petitioner-wife and no litigation expenses have been paid.

2. Though, notice of motion was issued as far back as on 18.01.2016 and as per the office report, the respondent has been served but nobody has put in appearance on any date of hearing which has taken place so far, which clearly shows that the respondent has no intention to defend the present proceedings and is accordingly proceeded ex-parte.

3. The respondent-husband filed a divorce petition seeking divorce from the petitioner-wife and during the pendency of the said divorce petition, an application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act was moved by the respondent-plaintiff seeking maintenance. The said

application has been allowed and the petitioner-wife has been granted the

maintenance allowance @ ₹6,000/- per month and the two minor children have been given the maintenance @ ₹7,000/- each per month. The said order dated dated 06.05.2015 (Annexure P-3) is under challenge in the present petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner argues that once the maintenance was sought by the petitioner-wife, it should have been awarded keeping in view the income of the respondent-husband and the standard of living of respondent-husband, which has already come on record. Learned counsel further argues that the minor children have been allowed maintenance @ ₹7,000/- each per month, whereas wife has been given maintenance @ ₹6,000/- per month and that too without justifying the said decision, hence, the maintenance awarded to the wife, is liable to be increased keeping in view the financial status as well as living station of the respondent-husnand.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have gone through the record with his able assistance.

6. It has already come on record that at the relevant time, the earning of the husband of petitioner-wife keeping in view the income tax return was ₹4,62,472/-. Further, he had purchased the properties and was maintaining three different cars, is also on record. It has been further averred that the petitioner was not earning anything and was dependent upon the claimed maintenance. In these hard days, it is difficult to maintain oneself within a sum of ₹6,000/- per month. Further, while awarding the maintenance, the trial court was required to see the status, income and living standard of the respondent-husband so as to award the appropriate

maintenance that the wife is also able to enjoy the same status.

7. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, the maintenance awarded in favour of the petitioner-wife to the tune of ₹6,000/ is enhanced to ₹10,000/- per month. Further, as the petition seeking divorce has been filed by the respondent-husband, the petitioner-wife will also be entitled for litigation expenses to the tune of ₹25,000/-.

8. The present civil revision petition is allowed in above terms.

**CM-27630-CII-2015**

As the revision petition is allowed, the present application is disposed of as such.

**May 11, 2023**  
*kanchan*

**(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)**  
**JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No*

*Whether reportable : Yes/No*