



\$~46

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 111/2025 & CRL.M.A. 7527/2025**

BIRENDER SINGHPetitioner
Through: Mr. M.L. Yadav, Mr.
Lokesh Chandra and Mr.
Prashant, Advs.

versus

SMT SUKHVINDER KAUR & ORS.Respondents
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **11.09.2025**

1. By the present petition, the petitioner challenges the order dated 10.01.2025 (hereafter '**impugned order**'), passed by the learned Family Court, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi in Mt. No. 525/2023.
2. By the impugned order, the learned Family Court granted interim maintenance of ₹12,000/- per month (that is, ₹4,000/- to each respondent).
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that Respondent No. 1 misrepresented to the learned Family Court that the petitioner is working as a Junior Engineer with NTPC and he is earning a monthly salary of more than ₹1,00,000/- per month, which led to passing of the impugned order.
4. He relies upon the termination letter dated 31.08.2023, which indicates that the petitioner's services were terminated by the NTPC with effect from 30.09.2023.
5. It is pertinent to note that the said termination letter has been duly considered by the learned Family Court. It is noted in the impugned order that the respondent cannot rely on the same



to claim that he is unemployed. As rightly held by the learned Family Judge, being an able-bodied, the petitioner is duty bound to maintain the respondents and he cannot shirk his sacrosanct duty by making such bald excuses.

6. Even otherwise, it is not disputed that the petitioner is a well-qualified Engineer with prior work experience at NTPC. Only a meagre amount of ₹12,000/- has been awarded by the learned Family Court, that is, only ₹4,000/- for each of the respondents, who are admittedly the wife and two minor children of the petitioner respectively.

7. It is pertinent to note that the respondents appear to be the only dependants of the petitioner and it is not his case that he also has to maintain his old father, who was also earlier employed at NTPS and is getting a handsome pension. In such circumstances, as the respondents are the only dependants of the petitioner, *prima facie*, the awarded amount does not appear to be unreasonable.

8. Moreover, the impugned order is only an order of interim maintenance and the learned Trial Court would pass a final order in regard to maintenance after considering the evidence on record.

9. Considering that the amount awarded is not too high, that the petitioner is a qualified Engineer and the maintenance amount is also meant for two minor children of the parties, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order.

10. The present petition is, therefore, dismissed. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 11, 2025/ 'KDK'