



119

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

**CRR(F)-472-2025
Date of decision: 02.04.2025**

JITENDER GROVER

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SONIA

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. C. R. Narwal, Advocate for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed for setting aside the impugned judgment dated 23.01.2025 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court at Hansi, District Hisar, vide which maintenance has been granted to the respondent-wife to the tune of Rs.8,500/- per month.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is a case where the respondent-wife has withdrawn from the society of the petitioner-husband and there were no allegations of harassment etc. against the petitioner. He further submitted that the income of the petitioner was only Rs.35,000/- per month and he has to pay EMIs of various loans for which he would require money and as the respondent-wife is an educated lady having qualification of JBT and was working prior to the filing of the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C., it was her duty to work and maintain herself and therefore, no liability can be cast upon the petitioner-husband for maintaining the respondent-wife



when she is otherwise qualified for earning money. He also submitted that earlier various negotiations were carried out in order to effect compromise between the parties but the same could not be effected and therefore, the impugned judgment dated 23.01.2025 may be set aside.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. The present is a revision petition filed by the petitioner-husband and a bare perusal of the aforesaid judgment dated 23.01.2025 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court at Hansi, District Hisar would show that the petitioner in his cross-examination has admitted that he is posted in IndusInd Bank, Dabra Chowk, Hisar and his total salary is Rs.42,000/- per month and he is posted in the aforesaid Bank for the last two years. The factum of marriage between the petitioner and respondent is not in dispute and it is also not in dispute that no child is born out of the said wedlock. On the other hand, the respondent-wife is stated to be having no source of income at all, although prior to the filing of the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. she had worked at different places for some time.

5. An argument has been raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the respondent-wife, although legally wedded wife is qualified and having knowledge of art, craft and stitching and was also working as a Teacher in a private school, is not entitled for maintenance. So far as the question with regard to respondent-wife working or not is concerned, it has been observed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court at Hansi, District Hisar that neither any document has been placed on record nor it has been proved by the petitioner-husband that the respondent-wife is working anywhere, although before filing the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C., she had



worked at different places for some time and therefore, in the revisional jurisdiction, this Court cannot record a finding that respondent-wife is working. So far as the fact that the respondent-wife is having knowledge of art, craft and stitching is concerned, the same also cannot become a ground for denial of maintenance to the respondent-wife when it is shown and proved on the record that respondent-wife is having no source of income.

6. Admittedly, the total income of the petitioner-husband is Rs.42,000/- per month and the respondent-wife is having no source of income at all. So far as the aforesaid amount of maintenance, which has been granted by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court at Hansi, District Hisar to the respondent-wife to the tune of Rs.8,500/- per month is concerned, the same cannot be said to be on the higher side by any stretch of imagination.

7. After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and perusing the aforesaid judgment, vide which maintenance has been granted to the respondent-wife to the tune of Rs.8,500/- per month, this Court is of the considered view that no illegality or perversity can be found in the impugned judgment dated 23.01.2025 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court at Hansi, District Hisar, especially when the scope of revision petition is very limited.

8. Consequently, finding no merit in the present revision petition, the same is hereby dismissed.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

02.04.2025
Chetan Thakur

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