

**CRR(F)-1706-2025**

1

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

(121)

CRR(F)-1706-2025

Date of Decision:- 10.12.2025

Parminder Kaur

.....Petitioner

Versus

Jarnail Singh

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present: Mr. Vikas Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present revision petition has been filed, *inter alia*, challenging the order dated 16.09.2025 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Mansa, whereby the maintenance amount of ₹7,500/- was enhanced to 1/3rd of net salary i.e. ₹15,000/- per month. The petitioner, being dissatisfied with the said enhancement, has approached this Court contending that she is entitled to a much higher amount of maintenance i.e. 1/3rd of gross salary of respondent.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the learned trial Court erred in determining the quantum of maintenance. It is argued that the salary slip of the respondent clearly shows that he is earning a sum of ₹58,016/-, however, the learned trial Court wrongly accepted voluntary deductions and assessed his take-home salary as ₹45,000/-, and thereafter granted 1/3rd of the same as maintenance. Learned counsel for the petitioner



further submits that the legislation in question is a piece of social welfare legislation and must be construed and applied liberally. The petitioner is entitled to the same standard of living, amenities and well-being as are being enjoyed by the respondent-husband.

4. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length.

5. Upon careful consideration of the material placed on record, this Court finds that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that there is an actual increase in the petitioner's reasonable needs or expenses, which are not met by maintenance already granted to the petitioner. Furthermore, the averment with regard to the increase in the cost of living cannot be considered in isolation, as such increase is ordinarily accompanied by corresponding revisions in salary also. However, in present case, there is no material which could demonstrate that the part of respondent's salary granted as maintenance has not kept pace with such increase in cost of living or that the petitioner has suffered any financial hardship as a result thereof. As regards to the allegation that the deductions reflected in the salary slip are voluntary in nature, even if that is assumed to be correct, it would not materially alter the overall assessment.

6. Therefore, the present petition appears to be an attempt to seek an enhancement beyond, what is reasonably justified, which is not the underlying intent of maintenance legislation. The husband is also a human being and a citizen of this country, and is equally entitled to lead a dignified life.

7. Furthermore, it is apposite to mention that while passing the impugned order, the learned trial Court, has not touched even a single



evidence brought on record by the petitioner, regarding the alleged change in her expenses, which could demonstrate the actual amount, she claims to be spending. Therefore, the impugned order appears to have been passed in a mechanical manner merely on the premise that the basic necessities of life have become expensive and that it is difficult to survive on an amount of ₹7,500/- per month. Such a generalised observation, by itself, cannot form the sole basis for enhancement of maintenance.

8. Nevertheless, it is apposite to discuss a peculiar trend of litigation that has emerged, wherein, the wife without demonstrating any cogent or justifiable reason for residing separately from her husband, file the application for maintenance and pursue it to the hilt. Although the law mandates that maintenance is to be granted to a wife who is living separately for a just cause and who is in a destitute condition, thereby, unable to maintain herself, however, the Court is equally conscious of the need to enhance the dignity, self-respect and independence of the women. In matters of maintenance, the object is not merely subsistence but also to enable the claimant to live with dignity, therefore, a part of maintenance amount must be utilized for skills enhancement and self-development so as to promote financial independence and long term self-reliance.

9. In light of the foregoing discussion, the petitioner is required to enhance her capabilities and stature in life so as to become self-reliant, only then it would reflect that the true intent of the maintenance legislation has been fulfilled and the maintenance awarded is being utilized in its correct perspective. Therefore, this Court considered it appropriate to direct the petitioner, that out of the maintenance amount of Rs. 15,000/- awarded

**CRR(F)-1706-2025**

4

to her, she must utilize at least 10% thereof, for improving her vocational skills.

10. In light of the above discussion, the Court does not find any reasonable ground that warrants interference, consequently, finding no merit in the present revision petition, the same is accordingly dismissed.

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

10.12.2025
Parul

Whether speaking/reasoned:-
Whether Reportable:-

Yes/No
Yes/No