

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRR(F) 855/2023

Date of decision: 24.07.2023.

Pooja Singla and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

Gian Chand Garg

.....Respondent

CORAM HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Gaurav Jain, Advocate for the petitioners.

Nidhi Gupta, J.

This revision petition is directed against the order dated 18.4.2023 passed by Id. Principal Judge, Family Court, Patiala whereby respondent was directed to pay interim maintenance to petitioner no.1 to the tune of Rs.3000/- per month, and Rs.2500/- per month to petitioner no.2, besides Rs.5000/- as one time litigation expenses. Prayer made herein is to enhance the said interim maintenance.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioners submits that marriage of petitioner no.1 and respondent was solemnized on 21.9.2018 and out of their wedlock, petitioner no.2 was born. It is submitted that respondent-husband filed a petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act wherein ex-parte decree of divorce has been passed against petitioner no.1 vide order dated 23.7.2021. It is submitted that petitioners have no source of income whereas respondent-husband has several well-established businesses. It is further submitted that the respondent also owns an orchard and four shops within the

limits of Khanna City. It is submitted that an affidavit to this effect was also filed by petitioner no.1, however, while passing the impugned order, this affidavit has been ignored by the ld. Family Court, Patiala.

Heard ld. Counsel for the petitioners.

Perusal of the impugned order reveals that both sides filed affidavit of their income and assets before the Family Court, Patiala and finding of the Family Court in this regard is as follows:-

“From the perusal of affidavit of assets, income and expenditure filed by the respondent, it clearly reflects that respondent is B.Com and he shows his net income from his business as Rs.10,450/- per month approximately. On the other hand, petitioner has also done MBA but she has also not disclosed her income in the affidavit of income and assets. She is so also highly qualified. The contention of the respondent that petitioner is running the business of astrology under the name and style of Astroworld at high level at Patiala and earning more than Rs.80,000/- per month. It is a matter of evidence”.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioners is unable to dispute the above said findings of the Court below or show anything to the contrary to this Court.

Accordingly, I find no ground is made out to interfere in the impugned order. Present revision petition stands dismissed.

24.07.2023.
Joshi

(Nidhi Gupta)
Judge