



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

233

CRR(F)-523-2021 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.01.2025

REENA KUMARI AND ANR

....Petitioners

Versus

VIKAS

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present : Mr. Ajay Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Parveen Kumar Rohilla, Advocate
for the respondent.

KIRTI SINGH. J.(Oral)

1. The instant petition is directed against the order dated 09.11.2021 passed by the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Panipat, whereby, the petition filed by the petitioners (herein) under Section 125 of 1973 for grant of maintenance was allowed as follows:

“13. Thus, in view of above discussion, it is held that the petitioner No.1 is entitled for maintenance to the tune of Rs.3000/- per month and petitioner No.2 is entitled for maintenance to the tune of Rs.2000/- per month, total amounting Rs.5000/- per month, from the date of filing of this petition, alongwith litigation expenses of Rs.6,000/- accordingly respondent is liable to pay the same. The amount already paid in terms of order of grant of interim maintenance passed in this case shall be adjusted. Consequently, the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C is hereby partly allowed. Copy of this order be given to the petitioner/counsel of the petitioner, free of



- 2-

cost as envisaged under Section 128 Cr.P.C. Petition file be consigned to record room after due compliance.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has argued that the quantum of maintenance assessed by the learned Family Court is on the lower side and the same deserves to be enhanced suitably. Learned counsel has further argued that the respondent is a businessman, thus earning Rs.50,000/- per month. Apart from the aforesaid income, he is having movable and immovable property in his name, including two acres of agricultural land and thus from the above said sources he is earning Rs.1,00,000/- per month. It is, thus, pleaded that the quantum of maintenance awarded by the learned Family Court is on the lower side.

3. *Per contra*, learned counsel for the respondent submits that the learned Family Court has determined the quantum of maintenance based on the calculation of the income of the respondent. According to him, the petitioners (herein) have sufficient source of income and does not need any maintenance. Thus, it has been prayed that the present petition be dismissed.

4. I have heard counsel for the parties and have gone through the available records of the case.

5. During the course of hearing, it has transpired that the impugned judgment has been passed by the learned Family Court without seeking, from the rival parties, the affidavit(s) of assets and liabilities in terms of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Rajnish vs. Neha, 2021(2) SCC 324***.

6. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Aditi @ Mithi vs. Jitesh Sharma, 2023 INSC 981***; relevant whereof reads as under:-



- 3-

*“8. The manner in which maintenance payable under [Section 24](#) of the Hindu Mariage Act, 1955 or [Section 125](#) Cr.P.C. is to be assessed, was considered by this Court in its celebrated judgment in *Rajnish v. Neha and Another*, (2021) 2 SCC 324. Detailed guidelines were issued. It was noticed that the terms of maintenance are decided on the basis of pleadings of parties and on the basis of some amount of guess work. It is often seen that both the parties submit scanty material and do not disclose correct details. The tendency of the wife is to exaggerate her needs, whereas the husband tends to conceal his actual income. Keeping that in view, this Court laid down the procedure to streamline grant of maintenance. The judgments of various courts were referred to and response from various State Legal Services Authorities was sought. This Court even requested the National Legal Services Authority to submit a report on the suggestions received from the State Legal Services Authorities for framing guidelines on the affidavit of disclosure of assets and liabilities to be filed by the parties. Guidelines were issued in exercise of powers under [Article 136](#) read with [Article 142](#) of the Constitution of India, prescribing a uniform format of Affidavit of Disclosure of Assets and Liabilities to be filed in maintenance proceedings. The judgment was delivered on 04.11.2020. The affidavit was to be submitted in all maintenance proceedings including pending proceedings. The directions given are extracted as under:*

“72. Keeping in mind the need for a uniform format of Affidavit of Disclosure of Assets and Liabilities to be filed in maintenance proceedings, this Court considers it necessary to frame guidelines in exercise of our powers under [Article 136](#) read with [Article 142](#) of the Constitution of India:

72.1. (a) The Affidavit of Disclosure of Assets and Liabilities annexed at Enclosures I, II and III of this judgment, as may be applicable, shall be filed by the parties in all maintenance proceedings, including pending proceedings before the Family Court/District Court/Magistrate's Court concerned, as the case may be, throughout the country;

72.2. (b) The applicant making the claim for maintenance will be required to file a concise application accompanied with the Affidavit of Disclosure of Assets;

72.3. (c) The respondent must submit the reply along with the Affidavit of Disclosure within a maximum period of four weeks. The courts may not grant more than two opportunities for submission of the Affidavit of Disclosure of Assets and Liabilities to the respondent. If the respondent delays in filing the reply with the affidavit, and seeks more than two



- 4-

adjournments for this purpose, the court may consider exercising the power to strike off the defence of the respondent, if the conduct is found to be wilful and contumacious in delaying the proceedings [Kaushalya v. Mukesh Jain, (2020) 17 SCC 822 : 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1915] . On the failure to file the affidavit within the prescribed time, the Family Court may proceed to decide the application for maintenance on the basis of the affidavit filed by the applicant and the pleadings on record;

72.4. (d) The above format may be modified by the court concerned, if the exigencies of a case require the same. It would be left to the judicial discretion of the court concerned to issue necessary directions in this regard.

72.5. (e) If apart from the information contained in the Affidavits of Disclosure, any further information is required, the court concerned may pass appropriate orders in respect thereof.

72.6. (f) If there is any dispute with respect to the declaration made in the Affidavit of Disclosure, the aggrieved party may seek permission of the court to serve interrogatories, and seek production of relevant documents from the opposite party under Order 11 CPC. On filing of the affidavit, the court may invoke the provisions of [Order 10 CPC](#) or [Section 165](#) of the Evidence Act, 1872, if it considers it necessary to do so. The income of one party is often not within the knowledge of the other spouse. The court may invoke [Section 106](#) of the Evidence Act, 1872 if necessary, since the income, assets and liabilities of the spouse are within the personal knowledge of the party concerned.

72.7. (g) If during the course of proceedings, there is a change in the financial status of any party, or there is a change of any relevant circumstances, or if some new information comes to light, the party may submit an amended/supplementary affidavit, which would be considered by the court at the time of final determination.

72.8. (h) The pleadings made in the applications for maintenance and replies filed should be responsible pleadings; if false statements and misrepresentations are made, the court may consider initiation of proceeding under [Section 340](#) CrPC, and for contempt of court.

72.9. (i) In case the parties belong to the economically weaker sections (“EWS”), or are living below the poverty line (“BPL”), or are casual labourers, the requirement of filing the affidavit would be dispensed with.

72.10. (j) The Family Court/District Court/Magistrate's Court concerned must make an endeavour to decide the IA for interim

maintenance by a reasoned order, within a period of four to six months at the latest, after the Affidavits of Disclosure have been filed before the court.

72.11. (k) *A professional Marriage Counsellor must be made available in every Family Court.”*

xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx

14. *Nothing is evident from the record or even pointed out by the learned counsel for the appellant at the time of hearing that affidavits were filed by both the parties in terms of judgment of this Court in **Rajnesh’s** case (*supra*), which was directed to be communicated to all the High Courts for further circulation to all the Judicial Officers for awareness and implementation. The case in hand is not in isolation. Even after pronouncement of the aforesaid judgment, this Court is still coming across number of cases decided by the courts below fixing maintenance, either interim or final, without their being any affidavit on record filed by the parties. Apparently, the officers concerned have failed to take notice of the guidelines issued by this Court for expeditious disposal of cases involving grant of maintenance. Comprehensive guidelines were issued pertaining to overlapping jurisdiction among courts when concurrent remedies for grant of maintenance are available under the Special Marriage Act, 1954, [Section 125 Cr.P.C.](#), the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, [Hindu Marriage Act, 1955](#) and Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956, and Criteria for determining quantum of maintenance, date from which maintenance is to be awarded, enforcement of orders of maintenance including fixing payment of interim maintenance. As a result, the litigation which should close at the trial level is taken up to this Court and the parties are forced to litigate.”*

7. Thus, it is unequivocal that filing of affidavit(s) of assets and liabilities of rival parties, as mandated by the Hon’ble Supreme Court, is pertinent and essential.

8. It is not in dispute and rather has been conceded by the learned counsels for the rival parties that, that the affidavit(s) of assets/liabilities of rival parties were not brought on record. As a result thereof, the impugned judgment

cannot be sustained on this score alone.

9. Keeping in view the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, it is directed as follows:

(i) The impugned judgment dated 09.11.2021 passed by the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Panipat is set-aside.

(ii) The parties are directed (through their respective counsel) to appear before the said Family Court on 18.02.2025 whereinafter the said Family Court shall proceed further, in accordance with law, with the matter afresh & decide the same after taking affidavit(s) of assets/liabilities as directed for by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in the judgments titled as *Rajnish vs. Neha, 2021(2) SCC 324* and *Aditi @ Mithi (supra)*.

(iii) The petition (under Section 125 of Cr.P.C. of 1973 for grant of maintenance) was instituted in the year 2019 & hence the said Family Court is directed to decide the matter expeditiously, in accordance with law, preferably within a period of 04 months from date of the receipt/production of certified copy of this order.

(iv) The respondent shall continue to pay maintenance to the tune of Rs.3,000/- per month to petitioner No.1 and Rs.2,000/- per month to petitioner No.2 till final disposal of the case before learned Family Court.

10. Disposed of accordingly.

23.01.2025
amandeep

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No