



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

216-1 Date of decision: 13.09.2024

1. CRR(F)-956-2022

Sachin Taneja ...Petitioner
V/s

Amrita Arora and another ...Respondents

2. CRR(F)-1110-2022

Amrita Arora and another ...Petitioner
V/s

Sachin Taneja ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ishan Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner
in CRR(F)-956-2022 and the respondents
in CRR(F)-1110-2022
Mr. Tushaar Madaan, Advocate for the respondents
in CRR(F)-956-2022 and the petitioners in CRR(F)-1110-2022.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

Vide this common order, the afore-said two revision petitions arising out of the common impugned order are being disposed off. For the sake of brevity, recitals/facts are being taken from CRR(F)-956-2022.

1. The instant revision petition has been preferred against the order dated 29.07.2022 passed by the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Sangrur (hereinafter to be referred as 'impugned order') praying for setting-aside/modification of the quantum of interim maintenance awarded by the said order. Vide the impugned order; the respondents (wife and minor son) have been awarded interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.32,000/- per



month (i.e. Rs.20,000/- per month to respondent No.1-wife and Rs.12,000/- per month to respondent No.2 (minor son) from the date of the application along with litigation expenses of Rs.11,000/-. The respondents (wife and minor son) had filed a petition, under Section 125 of Cr.P.C., 1973 before the Family Court, stating that they are the wife and minor son, respectively, of the petitioner (husband) and are unable to maintain themselves and hence the interim maintenance ought to be awarded to them.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner-husband has argued that the respondent-wife has deserted the petitioner without any reasonable cause. According to learned counsel, the Family Court has grossly erred in computing the salary of the petitioner-husband while granting the interim maintenance to the respondents (wife and minor son). It has been further argued that the Family Court has completely overlooked the fact that the respondent-wife has sufficient source of income to maintain herself and the minor son as during their separation, she was working as an English Teacher at Nehru Public School Moga and it is hard to believe that she is unemployed now. According to the learned counsel, it is a settled proposition of law that the quantum of maintenance can be awarded in proportion to the income of the husband as it is a matter of record that the petitioner-husband was earning Rs.1.25 lacs per month at the time of initiation of the proceedings under Section 125 of Cr.P.C. and hence it is evident that the Family Court has granted the quantum of interim maintenance on the higher side and beyond the financial capacity of the petitioner-husband. Furthermore, the Family Court has failed to appreciate the fact that the respondent-wife has misrepresented by showing herself to



be unemployed. Learned counsel has further argued that the Family Court ought to have considered that the petitioner is the sole bread winner of his family, having responsibility to look after his old aged parents, who are suffering from various medical ailments and whom he is obliged to maintain, before fastening with the liability to pay the interim maintenance. 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. Hence, it has been prayed that the quantum of interim maintenance awarded vide impugned order be set-aside/modified.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondents has argued that the learned Family Court though has determined the quantum of maintenance based on the consideration of the expenditure incurred for the upbringing of respondent No.2 (minor child) and the facts and circumstances of the case but the same deserves to be enhanced by taking into consideration the earning capacity as well financial status of the petitioner, who is earning handsomely. Learned counsel has further argued that the respondent No.1 is homeless and is living at the mercy of her old aged parents. It has been further argued that the respondent No.2 is a school going child and has various additional expenses related to his education and overall development and hence the quantum of interim maintenance awarded vide impugned order is inadequate and the same deserves to be modified and enhanced accordingly.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the rival parties and have perused the record.



5. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment passed by the Hon’ble Supreme Court titled as **Rajnish 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 s 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”

6. 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, indubitably, is subject to final adjudication and it is a provisional step subject to final determination to be made at the conclusion of proceedings. In other words, the interim maintenance is only tentative & is subject to fixation of final maintenance.

7. Relationship between the parties is not in dispute. The facts of the instant case reflect that vide the impugned order; the respondents, who are the wife and minor son of the petitioner-husband, have been granted interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.32,000/- per month (i.e. Rs.20,000/- per month to respondent No.1-wife and Rs.12,000/- per month to respondent No.2 (minor son) from the date of the application. In the considered opinion of this Court, the interim maintenance amount awarded must be reasonable



so extravagant which becomes oppressive and unbearable for the husband, nor should it be so meager that it drives the wife to penury. The sufficiency of the quantum has to be adjudged so that the wife/minor children are able to maintain themselves with reasonable comfort. While going through the impugned order, it transpires that the petitioner-husband has himself admitted in his affidavit filed before the Family Court that he is serving in the capacity of a Manager with Accenture India Pvt. Ltd and earning a sum of Rs.2,26,458/- per month. Furthermore it has come on record that nothing concrete has come on record to show that the respondent-wife is earning sufficient income to maintain herself. The contentions raised by the learned counsel for the parties in the present two petitions that the respondent-wife, who is highly qualified has sufficient income to maintain herself and the minor son or the petitioner-husband has sufficient source of income, are in fact, matter of trial and hence the same should not be delved into at this stage. The same can be ascertained only after adducing evidence by the parties. Moreover, the impugned order is only an interim measure 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. In the instant case, the amount of interim maintenance, which has been directed to be paid by the petitioner (herein), vide the impugned order cannot be said to be on the higher/lower side and is rather just and appropriate in the facts/circumstances of the present case.



8. In view of the above, the interim maintenance granted by the Family Court does not call for any interference. Accordingly, both the petition are hereby dismissed.
9. Any observations made and/or submissions noted hereinabove shall not have any effect on the merits of the case and the Family Court shall proceed further, in accordance with law, without being influenced therefrom.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

September 13, 2024
Ajay

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