



230

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRR(F)-1414-2023 (O&M)

Date of decision: 29.07.2024

Manik Sachdeva

... Petitioner

Vs.

Shally and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Manoj Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ranjit Saini, Advocate and
Mr. Haneet Sharma, Advocate
for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present revision petition has been preferred against the impugned order dated 26.07.2022 passed by learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridabad, vide which, while dismissing the petition under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'Cr.P.C.') qua respondent No.1, maintenance of Rs.15,000/- per month was awarded to be paid to respondent No.2-minor son.

2. The marriage between the petitioner and respondent No.1 was



solemnized on 31.01.2016 according to Hindu rites and rituals. Out of this wedlock, one male child i.e. respondent No.2 was born. However, matrimonial dispute ensued between the couple and the respondents filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance of Rs.60,000/- per month. The petitioner filed a reply and contested the claim made by the respondents. Learned Family Court, vide order dated 26.07.2022, while declining the maintenance to respondent No.1-wife, granted maintenance allowance of Rs.15,000/- per month in favour of respondent No.2-minor son. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, contends that learned Family Court fell into grave error, while granting the amount of maintenance to respondent No.2, which is on higher side. At the time of marriage, salary of respondent No.1 was Rs.28,000/- per month and now she is getting monthly salary of Rs.31,000/- and as such, she is able to maintain the child.

4. Learned counsel for the respondents has supported the impugned order passed by learned Family Court, by contending that on correct appreciation of the material brought on record, an amount of Rs.15,000/- per month has rightly be awarded in favour of respondent No.2 being minor child, as the petitioner cannot shrug off his responsibility to maintain him.



5. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record with their able assistance, this Court finds no force in the arguments raised on behalf of the petitioner.

6. The object and purpose behind granting maintenance is to ensure that the dependent spouse/child 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 child. 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.

7. Further, 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.”

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

9. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***Khursheed Ahmad Vs. Smt. Zakira, 2007(3) CCC 363***, has held that the minor children cannot be barred from claiming maintenance under Section 125 Cr.P.C. if a decree for restitution of conjugal rights has been passed against the wife, which has attained finality. The rights of the children qua maintenance are independent of the proceedings against the wife. This view was reaffirmed by another Co-ordinate bench of this Court ***Nirmal Singh Vs. Gurvinder Kaur and others, 2008(3) CCC 236*** wherein it was held that the father cannot be allowed to shrug off his responsibility to maintain his children citing the compromise arrived at with the wife. Speaking through Justice R.S. Madan, the following was observed: -



“8. I have perused the compromise (Ex.C1) today produced before me by the learned counsel for the petitioner. It nowhere reflects that respondent No. 3 has accepted the maintenance amount in full and final settlement on behalf of respondents No. 1 and 2 also. The receipt attached with Exhibit CI reflects that a lump-sum amount of Rs. 70,000/- was accepted by respondent No. 3 as her past as well as future maintenance at the time of disposal of Hindu Marriage petition. It is a case where respondents No. 1 and 2 were not party in the Hindu Marriage petition. No interim maintenance was allowed to them in that petition. It is not the case of the petitioner that a petition under Section 26 of the Hindu Marriage Act was filed wherein any interim maintenance was fixed for the children. In the absence thereof also, statement of wife Manjit Kaur is of no value that she will maintain and educate the minor children.

9. The question of grant of maintenance of the children is governed by the statutes under the The Hindu Adoptions & Maintenance Act, 1956. The plea of the petitioner is falsified from the receipt which forms part of compromise, Ex.CI, which shows that no maintenance was ever accepted by their mother Manjit Kaur on their behalf. The question of making any statement by wife Manjit Kaur against the interest of the children is also not to be taken into account, unless a certificate is issued by a counsel representing the minors that the compromise is for the welfare of the minors. Order 32 Rule 7 of the Code of Civil Procedure provides safeguard to the future interests of the minors.

10. In the absence of abovesaid statutory requirements as well as that respondents No. 1 and 2 are not the party in the Hindu Marriage petition, the statement made by Manjit Kaur (respondent No. 3) has rightly been not taken into consideration by the learned Magistrate while fixing the interim maintenance under Section 125 Criminal Procedure Code. The present proceedings cannot be quashed for the simple reason that the wife has made a statement in a Hindu Marriage Act case that she would provide education and maintenance to the children. The petitioner is father of respondents No. 1 and 2 and cannot take the benefit from the statement of respondent No. 3 Manjit Kaur and wriggle out of his responsibility to maintain his legitimate children. The petitioner and respondent No. 3 after taking divorce are living separately with their respective spouses and children are living at the mercy of their grand-maternal parents.”



10. In view of the discussion above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the petitioner is duty bound to maintain respondent No.2-his minor son. Therefore, the present petition is dismissed being bereft of any merit.

11. All the pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

[HARPREET SINGH BRAR]
JUDGE

29.07.2024
vishnu

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No