



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

112

**CM-17288-CII-2025 and
CM-17289-CII-2025 in/and
FAO-M-2-2025
Date of Decision: 23.09.2025**

Vikas Sharma

....Appellant

Versus

Preeti Thakur

....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS SURI**

Present: Mr. Saransh Sabharwal, Advocate
for the appellant.

None for the respondent.

Harsimran Singh Sethi, J. (Oral)

CM-17288-CII-2025 and CM-17289-CII-2025

Present applications have been filed for grant of stay before Trial Court during the pendency of present appeal.

On the request of learned counsel for the appellant, the main case is taken on Board today.

FAO-M-2-2025

1. In the present appeal, the challenge is to the order dated 28.11.2024 passed by the Trial Court fixing the maintenance at Rs.15,000/- per month, which is to be given to the wife as well as the 13 years old daughter.



-: 2 :-

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the appellant submits that the said order dated 28.11.2024 fixing the monthly maintenance at Rs.15,000/- is highly disproportionate keeping in view the salary which is being generated by the appellant. Learned counsel for the appellant further submits that, as per the affidavit submitted, the salary of the appellant-husband is Rs.15,000/- per month, which has been ignored and a monthly maintenance of Rs.15,000/- has been fixed and there will be nothing left with the appellant to survive along with his widowed mother.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the appellant and have gone through the record with his able assistance.

4. It may be noticed that the appellant is a graduate in commerce and is also a diploma holder in software engineering. Though, the affidavit given by him states that he earns Rs.15,000/- but, during the hearing, learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant-husband is earning his livelihood from the to-let services to provide the accommodation to the tenants.

5. It may be noticed that the wife has to survive and 13 years old daughter also has to pursue her studies, in addition to the money required for the daily routine, so as to live a dignified life. The responsibility to take care of the wife as well as the young daughter rests upon the appellant. The assertion that the appellant-husband earns only Rs.15,000/- cannot be accepted, as even a daily wager earns much more than the same whereas, the appellant-husband is a commerce graduate having additional qualification of a diploma in software engineering.

6. The grant of a sum of Rs.500/- per day to the wife and the



-: 3 :-

daughter as maintenance, out of which, the wife and daughter have to sustain themselves and to take care of the education of the daughter, cannot be treated as exorbitant or disproportionate.

7. No ground is made out for any interference by this Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case.

8. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

9. Pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

(HARSIMRAN SINGH SETHI)
JUDGE

(VIKAS SURI)
JUDGE

September 23, 2025
Varinder

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes

Whether reportable : No