



112

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

**CRR(F)-658-2025
Date of decision: 10.07.2025**

DHARAMVIR

...Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

SUNITA ALIAS SITA AND OTHERS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI

Present:- Mr. Jasvinder Singh Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed for setting aside the order dated 20.02.2025 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rewari, vide which interim maintenance has been granted to respondent No.1- wife to the tune of Rs.4,000/- per month, respondent No.2-minor daughter to the tune of Rs.3,000/- per month and respondent No.3-minor daughter to the tune of Rs.3,000/- per month, totalling Rs.10,000/- per month.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that respondent No.1- wife has withdrawn from the society of the petitioner-husband and is living separately. He further submitted that so far as the petitioner-husband is concerned, although he retired from BSNL department as a Pole Mechanic and his income by way of pension is only Rs.34,500/- per month but at the same time, he is also suffering from cancer and he has his own medical expenses to



take care of. He further submitted that so far as respondent No.1-wife is concerned, the petitioner has purchased a plot in her name, where she is residing and so far as respondents No.2 and 3-minor daughters are concerned, the petitioner has already made fixed deposits of Rs.10,00,000/- each for them in the Post Office and therefore, considering the facts and circumstances, he is not liable to further maintain his wife and daughters. He further submitted that respondent No.1-wife has not disclosed any source of income and therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

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

4. It is a case where the petitioner-husband has filed the present revision petition challenging the order dated 20.02.2025 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rewari, whereby interim maintenance has been granted to the respondents as aforesaid. The marriage between the petitioner and respondent No.1 is not in dispute and it is also not in dispute that two minor daughters i.e. respondents No.2 and 3 were born out of the said wedlock, who are in the care and custody of respondent No.1-wife. The income of the petitioner-husband even after retirement by way of pension is Rs.34,500/- per month. There is no income shown of respondent No.1-wife and she is residing separately. An argument was raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner that since the petitioner has already made fixed deposits of Rs.10,00,000/- each in the names of his two daughters and has also transferred a plot in the name of his wife, he may not be burdened with further maintenance towards them.

5. The learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rewari has granted interim maintenance to respondent No.1-wife to the tune of Rs.4,000/- per



month, respondent No.2-minor daughter to the tune of Rs.3,000/- per month and respondent No.3-minor daughter to the tune of Rs.3,000/- per month, totalling Rs.10,000/- per month and on the other hand, the total income of the petitioner-husband is Rs.34,500/- per month. The argument which was raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner with regard to fixed deposits as aforesaid made in the names of respondent No.2 and 3-minor daughters as well as the plot transferred in the name of respondent No.1-wife is not sustainable because the right to seek maintenance flows from the statutory provisions of Section 125 Cr.P.C. It cannot be said that once the petitioner-husband has made some fixed deposits in the names of his daughters and transferred a plot in the name of respondent No.1-wife, then for all times to come his liability ceases to operate. Such liability ceases only when there are strong reasons for the same, such as if the husband is not earning anything or when there is a full and final settlement of the matrimonial dispute.

6. The learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rewari while considering the grant of interim maintenance has so observed that interim maintenance is granted to the respondents to prevent them from destitution and vagrancy. This Court is of the considered view that respondent No.1-wife, who is stated to be not earning anything, and two minor daughters in order to sustain their livelihood and to make their both ends meet are entitled for grant of maintenance under the statutory provisions of law.

7. The scope of a revision petition is always very limited and particularly when challenge has been laid to an interim order only. The facts and circumstances of the present case suggest that there is no illegality or perversity



in the impugned order dated 20.02.2025 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Rewari.

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

10.07.2025
Chetan Thakur

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

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