

2025:PHHC:058527



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

Sr. No.111

CRR(F)-569-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision : 05.05.2025

Jaskaran Singh

..... Petitioner

VERSUS

Veerpal Kaur and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Mr. Talwinder Singh, Advocate, for the applicant-petitioner.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)**CRM-15882-2025**

1. This application under Section 5 of Limitation Act read with Section 528 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS, 2023) has been filed for condonation of delay of 146 days in filing the present petition.

2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 146 days in filing the present petition is condoned.

CRR(F)-569-2025 (O&M)

3. The present petition has been preferred against order dated 16.08.2024 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib at Camp Court, Gidderbaha, under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C., whereby maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month was awarded in favour of respondent No.1-wife and Rs.6,000/- per month each to respondents No.2 and 3-children from the date of filing the petition till they attain the age of majority and Rs.10,000/- as litigation expenses.

4. The brief facts of the case are that the marriage between the petitioner and respondent No.1-wife was solemnised on 12.12.2006. Out of

2025:PHHC:058527



this wedlock, the petitioner was blessed with one daughter (respondent No.2) and one son (respondent No.3). A matrimonial dispute ensued between the couple and the respondents have filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C was got filed by the respondents for seeking maintenance. The petitioner filed a reply and contested the claim made by the respondent. The learned Court below vide order dated 16.08.2024 granted maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month in favour of respondent No.1-wife and Rs.6,000/- per month each to two minor children (respondents No.2 and 3 herein) from the date of filing the petition till they attain the age of majority and Rs.10,000/- as litigation expenses. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present petition.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib at Camp Court, Gidderbaha has wrongly allowed the maintenance to the respondents which is on the higher side. He further submits that respondent No.1-wife left the company of the petitioner on her own, without any reasonable cause. In fact, the petitioner had even filed a petition under Section 9 of Hindu Marriage Act for restitution of conjugal rights, which was allowed, but to no avail. Further, petitions for divorce, and custody of minor children are also pending. Thus, in view of wilful desertion of the petitioner by the respondents, they are not entitled to any maintenance.

6. 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.

2025:PHHC:058527



7. 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, children and parents, which also fall within the constitutional sweep of Article 15(3) reinforced by Article 39 of the Constitution of India.

8. 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.”

9. 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

2025:PHHC:058527



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.”

10. 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 and children being able to lead a life of reasonable comfort.

11. 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

2025:PHHC:058527



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.

2025:PHHC:058527



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."

12. 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 at the time of deciding the application for maintenance. The learned Court has observed that the wife-respondent No.1 herein had solemnly affirmed that the husband-petitioner herein is having 18 acres of agricultural land, and has also kept cattle, and is thus, earning Rs.1,50,000/- per month. In support of her submission, the wife-respondent No.1 herein had also placed on record before the Family Court, a jamabandi for the year 2017-18 to shows that the husband had 8/27 shares in khewat number 8/1 etc. It was also observed that the wife-respondent No.1 does not have any source of income. Learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to indicate any perversity in the impugned order which warrants interference

2025:PHHC:058527



by this Court. Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed being bereft of any merit.

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

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

05.05.2025

Ramandeep Singh

Whether speaking / reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No