

2025:PHHC:093082



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

Sr. No.119

CRR(F)-542-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 25.07.2025

Mukesh Kumar

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

Smt. Varsha and another

..... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Naffesh Ahmed, Advocate, for the petitioner
Through video conferencing.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been preferred against judgment dated 27.02.2025 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Sonipat, under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C., whereby maintenance of Rs.8,000/- per month was awarded in favour of respondent No.1-wife and Rs.4,000/- per month was awarded in favour of respondent No.2- minor son.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the marriage between the petitioner-husband and respondent No.1-wife was solemnised on 20.01.2016 according to the Hindu rites and ceremonies. A matrimonial dispute ensued between the couple and the respondents filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. for seeking maintenance. The petitioner filed a reply and contested the claim made by the respondents. The learned Family Court vide order dated 27.02.2025 granted maintenance of Rs.8,000/- per month in favour of respondent No.1-wife and Rs.4,000/- to respondent No.2-minor son. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present petition.

2025:PHHC:093082



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Sonipat has wrongly allowed the maintenance to the respondents which is on a very higher side and it has been passed totally on the basis of wrong facts. It is submitted that respondent No.1 left the company of the petitioner without any reasonable cause on 01.06.2016, and refused to return despite the repeated attempts at reconciliation made by the petitioner. Respondent No.1-wife even got registered an false FIR to implicate the petitioner. Qua the quantum of maintenance, it is submitted that respondent No.1 is a well qualified individual possessing degree of M.A. and B.Ed., and is earning Rs.30,000/- per month.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusing the record with his able assistance, this Court finds no force in the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner. The present petition is decided *in limine* in order to save litigation cost of the respondent and also to save the judicial time of the Court.

5. The object and purpose behind granting maintenance is to ensure that the dependent spouse and children are 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,

2025:PHHC:093082



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.”

7. 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. 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

2025:PHHC:093082



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 and children 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:

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:

2025:PHHC:093082



(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 arder 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 judgment passed by the learned Family Court makes it evident that the Court below has duly considered the material placed before it, including the pleas raised hereinabove at the time of deciding the application for maintenance. It was observed that given the fact that the husband had earned a diploma in ETT i.e. two years course of elementary teacher training, and the fact that he was admittedly working as a third party insurance loan agent, his income was assessed to be not less than Rs.25,000/-. As per the averments made by the wife before the learned Family Court, she does not have any source of income, a fact which could not be irrefutably rebutted by the petitioner. It was under these circumstances that the maintenance award at the rate of Rs.8,000/- and Rs.4,000/- per month was awarded to wife and the minor child of the petitioner respectively. 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 is dismissed being bereft of any merit.

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

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

25.07.2025
Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No