



**In The High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CM-22904-CII-2023 in/and
FAO-6612-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 11.08.2025

Rajesh Kumar ... Appellant

Versus

Meetu Rani ... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA**

Present:- Mr. Munish Mittal, Advocate, for the appellant.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

CM-22904-CII-2023

There is a delay of 230 days in filing this appeal.

In view of the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and delay of 230 days in filing the appeal is condoned.

FAO-6612-2023 (O&M)

1. Appellant-Rajesh Kumar (husband) assails order dated 23.1.2023 passed by the Family Court vide which an application filed by the respondent (wife) under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, has been accepted and the appellant (husband) has been directed to pay an amount of Rs.14,000/- per month as maintenance for his wife and minor daughter to the extent of



Rs.7,000/- each during the pendency of petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the Family Court fell in error in holding that the respondent was entitled to maintenance and that in any case the quantum of compensation, as assessed, is on the higher side particularly when the appellant was employed on a petty job in the Railway Department.
3. We have heard the learned counsel for the appellant and have also gone through the impugned order and also other documents annexed with the appeal.
4. It is not in dispute that the appellant was working in the Railway Department whereas the respondent has been found to be working as a Teacher earning around Rs.8443/- per month. Although, the appellant asserted that the respondent was earning Rs.35,000/- per month, but no evidence regarding such income has been brought on record. Similarly, while the respondent-wife asserted that the income of her husband was more than Rs.1 lakh per month, as he was working in Railway Department, the appellant admitted that his salary to be Rs.46,000/- per month. Even if the salary of the appellant is held to be Rs.46,000/- only, still given the fact that the admitted income of the respondent-wife is Rs.8443/-, the quantum of maintenance as assessed by the Family Court to the tune of Rs.14,000/- i.e. Rs.7000/- for wife and Rs.7000/- for minor daughter, cannot be said to be excessive or on the higher side.
5. The marriage in any case was subsequently dissolved by way of a judgment of decree of divorce on 02.02.2023, which would mean that the aforesaid



maintenance in terms of Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act would have come to an end upon finalization of the proceedings on 02.02.2023.

6. In any case, having regard to the salary of the respondent-husband, the maintenance pendente lite as assessed and awarded by the Family Court @ Rs.14,000/- per month and also litigation expenses to the tune of Rs.5,000/- are fairly justified and do not warrant any interference.
7. The appeal is sans merit and is hereby dismissed.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

(DEEPINDER SINGH NALWA)
JUDGE

11.08.2025
mohan

Whether speaking /reasoned

Yes / No

Whether Reportable

Yes / No