



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

108

CRR(F)-1096-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 06.09.2024

Bakhshish Rai

....Petitioner

V/s

Sapna and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Tejwinder S. Hundal, Advocate for
Mr. Nirmaljeet Singh Sidhu, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

SUME ET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. Present revision petition has been preferred against the order dated 10.04.2023 passed by the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Jalandhar (hereinafter to be referred as the 'concerned Family Court') praying for setting-aside of the said order. Vide the impugned order; the respondents (herein) have been awarded interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.6000/- per month (i.e. Rs.3500/- per month to respondent No.1-wife and Rs.2500/- per month to respondent No.2 (minor daughter)) alongwith the litigation expenses of Rs.3000/- to be paid by the petitioner (herein) from the date of application.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has argued that the Family Court has wrongly assessed the income of the petitioner without appreciating the facts put forth by him and hence granted the interim maintenance to the respondents, which is on the higher side. According to the learned counsel, the Family Court, in assessing the quantum of interim maintenance, has

completely overlooked the fact that the respondent No.1-wife has substantial



source of income by doing tailoring work which has not been disclosed by her before the Family Court. Learned counsel has further argued that, in any case, the Family Court has adopted a wholly wrong approach while granting the quantum of interim maintenance and the same has been erroneously fastened upon the petitioner. Thus, it has been prayed that the instant petition be accepted and the impugned order dated 10.04.2023 be set-aside.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and have perused the record.

4. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court titled as ***Rajnesh vs. Neha & Anr.: 2021(2) SCC 324***; relevant whereof reads as under:-

“II Payment of interim Maintenance

- (i) *The proviso to Section 24 of the HMA (inserted vide Act 49 of 2001 w.e.f. 24.09.2001), and the third proviso to Section 125 Cr.P.C., 1973 (inserted vide Act 50 of 2001 w.e.f. 24.09.2001) provide that the proceedings for interim maintenance, shall as far as possible, be disposed of within 60 days' from the date of service of notice on the contesting spouse. Despite the statutory provisions granting a time-bound period for disposal of proceedings for interim maintenance, we find that application remain pending for several years in most of the cases. The delays are caused by various factors, such as tremendous docket pressure on the Family Courts, repetitive adjournments sought by parties, enormous time taken for completion of pleadings at the interim stage itself, etc. Pendency of applications for maintenance at the interim stage for several years defeats the very object of the legislation.*
- (ii) *At present, the issue of interim maintenance is decided on the basis of pleadings, where some amount of guess-work or rough estimation takes place, so as to make a prima facie assessment of the amount to be awarded. It is often seen that both parties submit scanty material, do not disclose the correct details, and suppress vital information, which makes it difficult for the Family Courts to make an objective assessment for grant of interim maintenance. While there is a tendency on the part of the wife to exaggerate*



her needs, there is a corresponding tendency by the husband to conceal his actual income.

74.It has therefore, become necessary to lay down a procedure to streamline, the proceedings, since a dependant wife, who has no other source of income, has to take recourse to borrowings from her parents/relatives during the interregnum to sustain herself and the minor children, till she begins receiving interim maintenance.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx
xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

(j) The concerned Family Court /District Court/Magistrate’s Court must make an endeavour to decide the I.A. for Interim Maintenance by a reasoned order, within a period of four to six months at the latest, after the Affidavits of Disclosure have been filed before the court.

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx
xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

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

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx
xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx”

5. Vide the impugned order passed by the Family Court, the aspect of interim maintenance has been decided. It goes without saying that a decision upon the aspect (especially quantum) of interim maintenance, being result of some element of estimation, has to be construed accordingly as the entitlement of the applicant (making a plea for grant of interim maintenance) cannot be based upon exact arithmetical calculations at such stage. The order granting interim maintenance is, indubitably, subject to final adjudication and it is a provisional step subject to final determination to be made on the conclusion of proceedings. In other words, the interim maintenance is only tentative & is subject to fixation of final maintenance.



6. Relationship between the parties is not in dispute. The facts of the instant case reflect that vide the impugned order; the respondents (herein), who is the wife and minor daughter of the petitioner, have been granted interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.6000/- per month (i.e. Rs.3500/- per month to respondent No.1-wife and Rs.2500/- per month to respondent No.2 (minor daughter). The plea of the petitioner-husband that he does not possess sufficient source of income *ipso facto* does not absolve him of his moral duty to maintain his wife and minor child. The interim maintenance awarded to the wife should neither be so extravagant which becomes oppressive and unbearable for the husband, nor should it be so meager that it drives the wife to penury. While going through the impugned order, it transpires that as per the affidavit of disclosure of assets and liabilities filed before the Family Court, the petitioner-husband is working as Lab Technician in a private hospital and was earning Rs.12,000/- per month. Moreover, the petitioner has not placed on record any document to show that the respondent No.1-wife has any specific income from any particular source of income in his individual capacity. The contentions raised by learned counsel for the petitioner in the present petition with regard to factual aspect, are matter of trial and no comment on the same can be made at this stage. The same can be ascertained only after adducing evidence by the parties. It is also apparent from the record that the order under challenge is only an interim in nature and not a final decision of the maintenance petition. The amount of maintenance awarded is always subject to the adjustment which will depend on the final outcome of the maintenance petition filed by the respondent/wife.



6.1 Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, income of the petitioner; status of the parties; their standard of living and requirements of the wife-respondent No.1 and her minor daughter-respondent No.2, the amount of Rs.6000/- per month, which has been directed to be paid by the petitioner (herein), vide the impugned order cannot be said to be on the higher side and is rather just and appropriate in the facts/circumstances of the case. It is trite law that the Court has to strike a balance in case a husband neglects or refuses to maintain his wife/children & the wife who is struggling financially and is unable to maintain herself and her minor child can take benefit of the provision of Section 125 Cr.P.C. which would serve as a quick remedy.

7. In view of above, the interim maintenance granted by the Family Court does not call for any interference. Accordingly, the instant petition is hereby dismissed.

8. Any observations made and/or submissions noted hereinabove shall not have any effect on merits of the case and the Family Court shall proceed further, in accordance with law, without being influenced with them.

9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

September 06, 2024
Ajay

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