

CRR (F)-18-2017 (O&M)

2024.PHHC:107664



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

108+218

CRR (F)-18-2017 (O&M)

Date of decision: August 20, 2024

KAMAL SINGH

....Petitioner

Versus

SUNITA AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present:- Mr. Ankush Chaudhary, Advocate for the petitioner.
(Through Video Conferencing)

Mr. Nipun Vashist, Advocate for the respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J.

CRM-21536-2024

Prayer made in the application is allowed.

Documents (Annexures P-7 to P-9) are taken on record subject to all
just exceptions.

CRR (F)-18-2017

1. The petitioner is challenging the order dated 27.10.2016 passed by District Judge, Family Court, Gurgaon, whereby he has been directed to make payment of maintenance amount of Rs. 12,000/- per month (Rs. 8,000/- per month to respondent No. 1-wife and Rs. 4,000/- per month to respondent No. 2-minor son) in favour of respondents.



2. The marriage between the petitioner-husband and respondent No.1-wife was solemnized on 27.06.2004 as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. One child i.e. respondent No. 2 was born from the said wedlock. However, matrimonial dispute ensued between the couple and the respondents filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance. The petitioner-husband filed a reply and contested the claim made by the respondents. The learned Family Court, Gurgaon vide impugned order dated 27.10.2016 granted maintenance of Rs. 12,000/- per month (Rs. 8,000/- per month to respondent No. 1-wife and Rs. 3,000/- per month to respondent No. 2-minor son) in favour of respondents. Aggrieved by the same, petitioner-husband has preferred this revision petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia contends that the learned District Judge (Family Court) at Gurgaon has passed the impugned order dated 27.10.2016 and awarded a maintenance of Rs.8000/- per month to respondent no.1 and Rs.4000 per month to respondent no.2, which is not in consonance with the actual income of the petitioner. The respondent no.1 has not produced any evidence to show that she has no source of income. Further, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that respondent no.1 has concealed the fact that she is working and she has left the company of the petitioner without any justifiable reason.

4. On the other hand learned counsel for the respondents submits that in order to survive, respondent no.1 is working as part time school teacher and her salary statement has been produced on record as Ex-R5 which indicates that her salary has varied between Rs.4960-Rs.6375, whereas the school fee of the minor child is Rs.2700 per month, apart from other expenses and as such the learned Family Court has rightly awarded the amount of maintenance.



5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file with their able assistance.

6. 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.

7. 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.”

8. Another objective of the legislature sought to be achieved 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.

9. 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.

10. While dealing with the issue of maintenance in extenso, a two Judge bench of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Rajnish 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-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.

2024.PHHC:107664



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 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'

11. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the record, this Court finds no force in the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner. It transpires that the petitioner himself admitted the mutation Ex.P-2, according to which the petitioner is the owner of a plot. Further petitioner has admitted that he has purchased the automobile vide Ex.P-5. However, he claimed to have sold it. The petitioner was confronted with the fact that he is running a grocery shop, but he has declined to disclose his income. Further documents pertaining to autos and cabs purchased by him were proved as Ex.P-5, Ex.P-6 and Ex.P-23. As such, learned Family Court below has rightly assessed the income of the petitioner and awarded a maintenance of Rs.8000/- per month to respondent



no.1 and Rs.4000 per month to respondent no.2. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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.

August 20, 2024

ritu

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable:	No