

110

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

2023:PHHC:080060

CRM-25420-2023 in/and CRR(F)-877-2023

Date of Decision: 01.06.2023

Gourav Gahlot

. . . . Petitioner

Vs.

Tannu

. . . . Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA

Present Mr.Bhuwnesh Lakhera, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA, J.(Oral)

CRM-25420-2023

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is
allowed.

Delay of 30 days in filing the present revision petition is
condoned.

CRR(F)-877-2023

Learned counsel for the petitioner assails the order of interim
maintenance awarded to the wife. Learned counsel submits that the
respondent/wife is working and she has concealed this fact and therefore she
should not be granted interim maintenance. He submits that the petitioner is a
home guard and is getting daily allowance of Rs.788/-, and therefore there
was no occasion to grant interim maintenance to the sum of Rs.7,000/- per
month.

I have considered the submissions.

This court finds that at this stage of granting interim maintenance, the Court only looks into the *prima facie* aspects and the facts which have come on record, *per se*.

The learned Principal Judge, Family Court has *prima facie* recorded that the petitioner receives a daily allowance of Rs.788/- and his income comes to Rs.23,640/- per month. The statement regarding the earning of the respondent/wife has not been accepted by the Court below as the documents placed on record with regard to respondent working have not been found to be authentic.

In view thereof, this Court in revision has a limited jurisdiction, and therefore does not deem it appropriate to interfere with the maintenance allowance awarded to the respondent/wife.

Accordingly, this Petition is dismissed.

(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)
JUDGE

June 01, 2023

mohit

1. *Whether speaking/reasoned?*
2. *Whether reportable?*

Yes/No
Yes/No