



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

CRR(F)-1194-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision: 16.09.2024

RUPINDER KAUR AND OTHERS

...PETITIONERS

V/S

HARJIT SINGH

...RESPONDENT

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Shamsher Singh Gill, Advocate (through video conferencing)
for the petitioners.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (ORAL)

CRM-37389-2024

This is an application under Section 5 of Limitation Act 1963 read with Section 528 of BNSS of 2023 seeking condonation of delay of 37 days in filing the main revision petition.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, same is allowed and delay of 37 days in filing the revision petition CRR(F)-1194-2024, is condoned.

CRR(F)-1194-2024

1. The present revision petition has been preferred against the impugned order dated 08.05.2024 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Ludhiana, Camp Court at Samrala in maintenance case No. MNT/23/2022 vide which interim maintenance to the tune of Rs. 7,000/- per month (i.e. Rs. 3,000/- per month to petitioner No. 1-wife and Rs. 2,000/- per month each to petitioners No. 2 and 3-minor daughters) was awarded in favour of petitioners.



2. The marriage between the petitioner No. 1-wife and respondent-husband was solemnized on 05.10.2011. Two female children i.e. petitioners No. 2 and 3 were born from the wedlock. However, matrimonial dispute ensued between the couple and the petitioners filed a petition seeking interim maintenance. The respondent-husband filed a reply and contested the claim made by the petitioners. The learned Family Court, Ludhiana, Camp Court at Samrala, vide impugned order dated 08.05.2024 awarded interim maintenance of Rs. 7,000/- per month (i.e. Rs. 3,000/- per month to petitioner No. 1-wife and Rs. 2,000/- per month each to petitioners No. 2 and 3-minor daughters) in favour of petitioners. Aggrieved by the same, petitioners have preferred this revision petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that learned Family Court has fallen into grave error by awarding a meager amount of Rs. 7,000/- per month in favour of petitioners as interim maintenance and admittedly the respondent is drawing a pension of Rs. 23,000/- per month and he is also earning by doing private job and the amount so assessed by the learned Family Court is not sufficient to sustain the petitioners.

4. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and gone through the case file with his able assistance.

5. The object and purpose behind granting maintenance is to ensure that the dependent spouse is 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 other spouse. 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 three-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Vimala (K.) v. Veeraswamy (K.) (1991) 2 SCC 375***, speaking through Justice Fatima Beevi, opined that as follows:

“3. Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure is meant to achieve a social purpose. The object is to prevent vagrancy and destitution. It provides a speedy remedy for the supply of food, clothing, and shelter to the deserted wife.”

A two-Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Kirtikant D. Vadodaria v. 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 during proceedings emerging out of matrimonial disputes so that the she/he can maintain herself/himself, have sufficient funds to pursue the litigation, and not suffer at the instance of the affluent spouse.

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 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 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 v. 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 -I 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 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 arder 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. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioners and after perusing the record, this Court finds no force in the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioners. Moreover, the amount of maintenance awarded by

learned Family Court below is only interim in nature subject to adjustment at the time of final disposal and parties are yet to prove their respective pleadings before the learned Family Court by adducing evidence in their support. Learned Family Court below has relied upon the fact that respondent was prematurely retired from service as he was physically unfit. The respondent could not stand for long time and he is sugar patient and suffering from cervical disease and his pension is Rs. 23,425/- per month and he can withdraw only Rs. 10,000/- per month as there was stay on the remaining pension on the application moved by the petitioner No. 1. Learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to indicate any perversity in the impugned order which warrants interference by this Court. Accordingly, this revision petition is hereby dismissed being bereft of any merit.

11. Pending CRM(s), if any, are also disposed of accordingly.
12. Nothing observed hereinabove shall be construed as expression of opinion of this Court on merits of the case and the trial Court shall proceed without being prejudiced by observations of this Court.

September 16, 2024
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

(i)	Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
(ii)	Whether reportable	Yes/No