

BHUPINDER SINGH

...PETITIONER

V/S

AMANDEEP KAUR AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Tarun Singla, Advocate and
Mr. Ashim Singla, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Paras Jhamb, Advocate for
Mr. A.S. Sekhon, Advocate for respondents.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been preferred against the impugned order dated 10.08.2017 passed by learned Family Court, Faridkot under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C. vide which, the maintenance of Rs.1500/- per month was awarded to each respondent.

2. The marriage between the petitioner and respondent No.1 was solemnised on 25.03.2011 in accordance with Sikh rites and rituals. Out of the wedlock, two children (one male and one female) were born. However, matrimonial dispute ensued between the couple and respondents filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance. The petitioner filed a reply and contested the claim made by the respondents. The learned Family Court vide order dated 10.08.2017 granted maintenance allowance of Rs.1500/- per month in favour of each respondent. 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 the

respondent No.1-wife has left the petitioner's company without any justifiable cause and under a deep rooted conspiracy, she got registered an FIR against the petitioner and his father vide FIR No.80 dated 11.10.2016 at PS City Rampura registered under Sections 323/324/34 IPC and the investigating agency after conclusion of the investigation, found the veracity of the allegations levelled by respondent No.1-wife to be false and has recommended the cancellation of the FIR. It is further submitted that respondent No.1-wife is employed in the Trident Group and is earning Rs.9,000/- per month.

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

"III Criteria for determining quantum of maintenance

(i) The objective of granting interim/permanent alimony is to ensure that the dependant spouse is not reduced to destitution or vagrancy on account of the failure of the marriage, and not as a punishment to the other spouse. There is no straitjacket formula for fixing the quantum of maintenance to be awarded.

82. The factors which would weigh with the Court inter alia are the status of the parties; reasonable needs of the wife and dependent children; whether the applicant is educated and professionally qualified; whether the applicant has any independent source of income; whether the income is sufficient to enable her to maintain the same standard of living as she was accustomed to in her matrimonial home; whether the applicant was employed prior to her marriage; whether she was working during the subsistence of the marriage; whether the wife was required to sacrifice her employment opportunities for nurturing the family, child rearing, and looking after adult members of the family; reasonable costs of litigation for a non-working wife. Refer to Jasbir Kaur Sehgal v. District Judge, Dehradun and others

(1997) 7 SCC 7. Refer to Vinny Paramvir Parmar v. Paramvir Parmar (2011) 13 SCC 112.

83. In Manish Jain v. Akanksha Jain (2017) 15 SCC 801 this Court held that the financial position of the parents of the applicant-wife, would not be material while determining the quantum of maintenance. An order of interim maintenance is conditional on the circumstance that the wife or husband who makes a claim has no independent income, sufficient for her or his support. It is no answer to a claim of maintenance that the wife is educated and could support herself. The court must take into consideration the status of the parties and the capacity of the spouse to pay for her or his support. Maintenance is dependent upon factual situations; the Court should mould the claim for maintenance based on various factors brought before it.

84. On the other hand, the financial capacity of the husband, his actual income, reasonable expenses for his own maintenance, and dependant family members whom he is obliged to maintain under the law, liabilities if any, would be required to be taken into consideration, to arrive at the appropriate quantum of maintenance to be paid. The Court must have due regard to the standard of living of the husband, as well as the spiralling inflation rates and high costs of living. The plea of the husband that he does not possess any source of income ipso facto does not absolve him of his moral duty to maintain his wife if he is able bodied and has educational qualifications. Reema Salkan v. Sumer Singh Salkan (2019) 12 SCC 303.

(ii) A careful and just balance must be drawn between all relevant factors. The test for determination of maintenance in matrimonial disputes depends on the financial status of the respondent, and the standard of living that the applicant was accustomed to in her matrimonial home. Chaturbhuj v. Sita Bai (2008) 2 SCC 316.

85. The maintenance amount awarded must be reasonable and realistic, and avoid either of the two extremes i.e. maintenance

awarded to the wife should neither be so extravagant which becomes oppressive and unbearable for the respondent, nor should it be so meagre that it drives the wife to penury. The sufficiency of the quantum has to be adjudged so that the wife is able to maintain herself with reasonable comfort.

(iii) Section 23 of HAMA provides statutory guidance with respect to the criteria for determining the quantum of maintenance. Sub-section (2) of Section 23 of HAMA provides the following factors which may be taken into consideration : (i) position and status of the parties, (ii) reasonable wants of the claimant, (iii) if the petitioner/claimant is living separately, the justification for the same, (iv) value of the claimant's property and any income derived from such property, (v) income from claimant's own earning or from any other source.

(iv) Section 20(2) of the D.V. Act provides that the monetary relief granted to the aggrieved woman and/or the children must be adequate, fair, reasonable, and consistent with the standard of living to which the aggrieved woman was accustomed to in her matrimonial home.

(v) The Delhi High Court in Bharat Hedge v. Smt. Saroj Hegde 40 (2007) DLT 16 laid down the following factors to be considered for determining maintenance :

"1. Status of the parties.

2. Reasonable wants of the claimant.

3. The independent income and property of the claimant.

4. The number of persons, the non-applicant has to maintain.

5. The amount should aid the applicant to live in a similar lifestyle as he/she enjoyed in the matrimonial home.

6. Non-applicant's liabilities, if any.

7. Provisions for food, clothing, shelter, education, medical attendance and treatment etc. of the applicant.

8. Payment capacity of the non-applicant.

9. Some guess work is not ruled out while estimating the income of the non-applicant when all the sources or correct sources are not disclosed.

10. The non-applicant to defray the cost of litigation.

11. The amount awarded under section 125 Cr.PC is adjustable against the amount awarded u/24 of the Act. 17."

(vi) Apart from the aforesaid factors enumerated hereinabove, certain additional factors would also be relevant for determining the quantum of maintenance payable."

xxx xxx xxx

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

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."

10. A perusal of the impugned order passed by the learned Family Court makes it evident that the Court below has duly considered the material placed before it for determining the quantum of maintenance. A careful and just balance has been drawn, keeping in view the spiralling inflation rates and

high cost of living corresponding to the reasonable needs of the respondent.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to indicate any perversity in the impugned order which warrants interference by this Court. Accordingly, the present petition as well as application for condonation of delay of 174 days is dismissed being bereft of any merit.

11. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

April 30, 2024
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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