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

1.**RA-CR-83-2024 (O&M)**
**in**
**CR-6312-2023**

Rupinder Chopra
....Petitioner

Versus

Gurbir Singh Chopra
..Respondent

2.1.**RA-CR-81-2024 (O&M)**
**in**
**CR-373-2024**

Gurbir Singh Chopra
....Petitioner

Versus

Rupinder Chopra
..Respondent

Date of decision: 24.05.2024

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL**

Present:- Mr. Raman Mahajan, Advocate for the review applicant/Gurbir Singh Chopra in both the review applications

Mr. Gaurav Chopra, Sr. Advocate with Mr. Divanshu Jain, Mr. Jaskaran Singh, Advocates for non-applicants/Rupinder Chopra

**ANIL KSHETARPAL, J (Oral)**

1. Two connected review applications have been filed in deference to the liberty granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the order dated 06.05.2024 which reads as under:-

Rekha Sihag
2024.05.28 16:48
I attest to the accuracy and integrity of this document
Chandigarh

> *"1. Learned counsel for the petitioner-husband seeks leave to withdraw the present petitions while reserving the right of his client to approach the High Court with an application seeking review of the impugned order dated 19th March, 2024, on the ground that some arithmetical error has crept in the said order in respect of recording the annual income of the petitioner-husband. If such an application is moved within one week from today, the other side shall not raise any objection as to the maintainability thereof on the ground of limitation. The respondent-wife is however, at liberty to oppose the said application.*
>
> *2. Learned counsel for the respondent-wife, who appears on caveat, assures the Court that his client shall not raise any objection to the review application on the ground of limitation.*
>
> *3. The Petitions for Special Leave to Appeal are disposed of as withdrawn with liberty granted as prayed for.*
>
> *4. However, if the petitioner is aggrieved by the orders passed in the review application, he is entitled to assail the same in accordance with law."*

2. It may be noted here that the Hon'ble Supreme Court has granted liberty to seek review of the impugned order on the ground that some arithmetic error has crept in. As per the learned counsel representing the parties, there is an arithmetic error. The total income of the husband as per income tax return of assessment year 2016-17 was Rs.1,33,19,109/-. After deduction of the tax, the net monthly income of the husband comes to Rs.7,29,913/- and not Rs.7,50,000/-. This Court has only awarded Rs.2,00,000/- as monthly maintenance. Hence, even if the error is corrected, there is no difference in the assessment of maintenance.

3. Learned counsel representing the review applicant has been heard at length. He has made submissions which would amount to re-

Rekha Sihag
2024.05.28 16:48
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
Chandigarh

hearing of the revision petition, which is not permissible under the garb of review.

4. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, no ground to review the order dated is made out.

5. Hence, dismissed.

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

24.05.2024 **(ANIL KSHETARPAL)**
rekha **JUDGE**
Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No

Rekha Sihag
2024.05.28 16:48
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document
Chandigarh