

108

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRR(F)-951-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 25.07.2024

Surinder Kumar

...Petitioner

Vs.

Prianshu and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. P.K.S. Phoolka, Advocate
for the petitioner.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present revision petition has been preferred against the impugned order dated 08.05.2024 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Bathinda, whereby the respondents were granted Rs.2,500/- per month each as interim maintenance under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.').
2. Briefly, the facts are that the marriage between the petitioner and Rajni was solemnised and out of this wedlock, two children i.e. the respondents were born. The respondents are minor and currently, they are residing with their mother. However, matrimonial dispute ensued and the



respondents filed an application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance of Rs.15,000/- per month. Learned Family Court, vide impugned order dated 08.05.2024, granted interim maintenance of Rs.2,500/- per month each in favour of the respondents. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that father of the petitioner is handicapped and partially blind. His parents are suffering from various age related ailments and he has to pay the EMIs of Rs.26,000/- per month for the loan already availed by him. Further, in the proceedings under Section 125 Cr.P.C., wife of the petitioner, namely Rajni, has already been granted interim maintenance of Rs.14,000/- per month vide order dated 27.09.2022 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Bathinda. As such, the petitioner is not in a position to pay the amount of interim maintenance to the respondents and prays for setting aside the impugned order.

4. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusing the record of the case with his able assistance, this Court finds no force in the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner.

5. The object and purpose behind granting maintenance is to ensure that the dependent spouse/children are not reduced to destitution or vagrancy on account of failure of marriage. At the same time, a just and careful balance must be struck to ensure that this provision does not degenerate into a weapon



to punish the children. The Courts are required to conduct the maintenance proceedings, while being alive to the legislative intent behind the provision under Section 125 Cr.P.C in its true spirit, which is to provide speedy assistance and social justice to women, children and infirm parents. The provisions of Section 125 Cr.P.C. were enacted as a measure to further social justice and protect dependent women, children and parents, which also fall within the constitutional sweep of Article 15(3) reinforced by Article 39 of the Constitution of India.

6. A two-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kirtikant D. Vadodaria Vs. State of Gujarat, (1996) 4 SCC 479***, speaking through Justice Faizan Uddin, opined as follows:

“15.... While dealing with the ambit and scope of the provision contained in Section 125 of the Code, it has to be borne in mind that the dominant and primary object is to give social justice to the woman, child and infirm parents, etc. and to prevent destitution and vagrancy by compelling those who can support those who are unable to support themselves but have a moral claim for support. The provisions in Section 125 provide a speedy remedy to those women, children and destitute parents who are in distress. The provisions in Section 125 are intended to achieve this special purpose. The dominant purpose behind the benevolent provisions contained in Section 125 clearly is that the wife, child and parents should not be left in a helpless state of distress, destitution and starvation.”



7. Another objective the legislature has sought to achieve by this provision is to provide maintenance *pendente lite* to the applicant spouse/children during proceedings emerging out of matrimonial disputes so that they can maintain themselves, have sufficient funds to pursue the litigation, and not suffer at the instance of the affluent spouse/parent.

8. There is a general tendency on the part of the wife to amplify her needs and the husband to conceal his actual income, making it difficult to determine the earning capacity of the rival claimants with exactitude. The rival claimants must scrupulously bring on record their actual respective earning capacities in order for the Court to arrive at quantum of maintenance which is just and fair in terms of principle of equistatus. The quantum of maintenance must be justifiable and realistic to provide succour to the dependent spouse/children and also to avoid occurrence of the two extremes of the maintenance being either paltry or extravagant, ensuring that neither of the two is reduced to a life of penury. The adequacy of the maintenance allowance has to be determined by the yardstick of the dependent spouse/children being able to lead a life of reasonable comfort.

9. While dealing with the issue of maintenance *in extenso*, a two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajnesh Vs. Neha and another, (2021) 2 SCC 324*** laid down the criteria for determining quantum of maintenance and issued the following directions:

"VI Final Directions



130. *In view of the foregoing discussion as contained in Part B - 1 to V of this judgment, we deem it appropriate to pass the following directions in exercise of our powers under Article 142 of the Constitution of India:*

(a) Issue of overlapping jurisdiction

131. *To overcome the issue of overlapping jurisdiction, and avoid conflicting orders being passed in different proceedings, it has become necessary to issue directions in this regard, so that there is uniformity in the practice followed by the Family Courts/District Courts/Magistrate Courts throughout the country. We direct that:*

- (i) where successive claims for maintenance are made by a party under different statutes, the Court would consider an adjustment or setoff, of the amount awarded in the previous proceeding/s, while determining whether any further amount is to be awarded in the subsequent proceeding;*
- (ii) it is made mandatory for the applicant to disclose the previous proceeding and the orders passed therein, in the subsequent proceeding;*
- (iii) if the order passed in the previous proceeding/s requires any modification or variation, it would be required to be done in the same proceeding*

(b) Payment of Interim Maintenance

132. *The Affidavit of Disclosure of Assets and Liabilities annexed as Enclosures I, II and III of this judgment, as may be applicable, shall be filed by both parties in all maintenance proceedings, including pending proceedings before the concerned Family Court / District Court / Magistrates Court, as the case may be, throughout the country.*

(c) Criteria for determining the quantum of maintenance

133. *For determining the quantum of maintenance payable to an applicant, the Court shall take into account the criteria enumerated in Part B III of the judgment.*

134. *The aforesaid factors are however not exhaustive, and the concerned Court may exercise its discretion to consider any other*

2024:PHHC:094322



factor/s which may be necessary or of relevance in the facts and circumstances of a case.

(d) Date from which maintenance is to be awarded


135. We make it clear that maintenance in all cases will be awarded from the date of filing the application for maintenance, as held in Part B-IV above.

(e) Enforcement/Execution of orders of maintenance

136. For enforcement/execution of orders of maintenance, it is directed that an order or decree of maintenance may be enforced under Section 28A of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1956; Section 20(6) of the D.V. Act; and Section 128 of Cr.P.C may be applicable. The order of maintenance may be enforced as a money decree of a civil court as per the provisions of the CPC more particularly Sections 51, 55, 58, 60 r.w. Order XXI."

10. From perusal of the record, it transpires that the respondents are minor and are residing with their mother. Respondent No.2 is suffering from diabetes and is taking treatment from Civil Hospital, Bathinda, which is discernible from medical record. The petitioner is working in Punjab Police and he is drawing net salary of Rs.57,772/- per month. It is statutory duty of the petitioner to maintain the minor children. Further perusal of the impugned order passed by learned Family Court makes it evident that the Court below has duly considered the material placed before it for determining the quantum of maintenance. A careful and just balance has been drawn, keeping in view the spiralling inflation rates and high cost of living corresponding to the reasonable needs of the respondents. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to indicate any perversity in the impugned order, which warrants

2024:PHHC:094322



interference by this Court. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed being bereft of any merit.

11. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and learned Family Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

25.07.2024
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No