

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

237

CRR(F)-920-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 06.09.2023

Rimpu Bala

.... Petitioner

Versus

Pawan Kumar

.... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. S.S. Salar, Advocate for the petitioner.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present revision petition has been filed by the petitioner/wife impugning the order dated 04.03.2023, whereby in an application filed by her under Section 125 Cr.P.C., the learned Family Court, Panchkula, has granted interim maintenance of Rs.3000/- per month to the petitioner/wife.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, submits that marriage of petitioner with respondent was solemnized on 17.05.2011 and out of the said wedlock, one male child was born on 22.02.2012, who is presently in the care and custody of the respondent/husband. The parties are living separately since 27.06.2020. It is submitted that the respondent/husband is admittedly earning salary of Rs.36,465/- per month and after deductions, he gets net salary of Rs.30,583/- per month and despite that the learned Family Court, vide impugned order, has awarded only Rs.3000/- per month as interim maintenance. Learned counsel

further submits that petitioner/wife is suffering from seizures for the last 05 years, therefore, she is unable to work. Thus, it is prayed that the interim maintenance of only Rs.3,000/- per month as awarded vide impugned order is inadequate and the same deserves to be enhanced.

3. No other argument is raised on behalf of the petitioner.
4. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner.
5. It has come on record that the learned Family Court, on perusal of the material available on record, including the payslip of respondent/husband for the month of September, 2022, recorded the findings that the gross salary of the respondent is Rs.36,465/- per month and after deductions, he gets net salary of Rs.30,583/- per month. It has further been recorded that the petitioner/wife is doing stitching work and is earning Rs.20,000/- per month. It has also come on record that the son born out of the wedlock of the parties is in the care and custody of the respondent/husband and being a school-going child, the respondent/husband has the additional responsibility of taking care of emotional, mental and physical welfare of the minor child.
6. As regards the assertion made by learned counsel for the petitioner that she suffers from seizures for the last 05 years, learned counsel very fairly admits that the said fact was not brought to the notice of the learned Family Court.
7. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to dispute or controvert the findings as recorded by the learned Family Court. Even nothing has been produced before this Court to show as to why the abovesaid findings are incorrect or ought to be rejected.

8. Accordingly, I find no ground is made out to exercise the revisional jurisdiction of this Court.

9. **Dismissed.**

10. Pending application(s), if any also stands disposed of.

06.09.2023

rishu

**(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No