



CRR(F)-970-2025 (O&amp;M)

-1-

112

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

\*\*\*

**CRR(F)-970-2025 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: 14.07.2025**

Yash Bharat Bhatia

..... Petitioner

Versus

Simran Singh Arora and another

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr. Ram Bilas Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present revision petition has been filed for challenging the order dated 16.04.2025 passed by learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridabad vide which interim maintenance has been granted to respondent No.2/minor daughter to the tune of ₹20,000/- per month from the date of filing of the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. and to the tune of ₹25,000/- per month from the date of passing of the judgment of maintenance till her attaining the age of majority. So far as respondent No.1/wife is concerned, no maintenance has been granted to her considering the fact that she is having source of income.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is a case where the marriage between the petitioner and respondent No.1 had taken place on 07.07.2018 at Faridabad and thereafter, a daughter was born out of the said wedlock. He further submitted that the marriage between the parties is not in dispute and it is also not in dispute that respondent No.2/daughter



**CRR(F)-970-2025 (O&M)**

**-2-**

was born out of the wedlock and she is in the care and custody of respondent No.1/wife. The age of the minor daughter is about 5-6 years.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner is aggrieved by the aforesaid impugned order passed by learned Family Court particularly on the quantum of maintenance which has been granted to respondent No.2/daughter and the same is on the higher side. He also submitted that it is not in dispute that the father is duty bound and statutorily liable to maintain his minor daughter but at the same time, it is a case where respondent No.1/wife, who has been denied maintenance, is also a working woman and is earning about ₹60,000/- per month and therefore, the aforesaid amount which has been fixed by way of the impugned order is on the higher side and the wife of the petitioner should also contribute towards the maintenance of the daughter. He further submitted that because of the aforesaid reason, the total maintenance which has been granted to respondent No.2/minor daughter is liable to be reduced. He also submitted that apart from the aforesaid maintenance which has been granted, he is also depositing an amount of ₹10,000/- per month in some Government Scheme although the same has not come on record in the impugned order.

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

5. The present is a criminal revision petition which has been filed by the petitioner, who is the husband seeking setting aside of the order dated 16.04.2025 passed by learned Family Court and during the course of arguments, learned counsel for the petitioner so submitted that the petitioner is challenging the quantum of maintenance being granted to respondent No.2. Respondent No.1 is the wife of the petitioner and respondent No.2 is the minor daughter of the petitioner, who is of the age of about 5-6 years.



**CRR(F)-970-2025 (O&M)**

**-3-**

Learned Judge, Family Court, Faridabad had denied the maintenance to respondent No.1/wife on the ground that she is having her own source of income but has granted maintenance to respondent No.2/minor daughter to the tune of ₹20,000/- per month from the date of filing of the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. and to the tune of ₹25,000/- per month from the date of passing of the judgment of maintenance till her attaining the age of majority. A perusal of the impugned order would show that so far as the respondent No.1/wife is concerned, her income has been dealt in detail by learned Family Court. Respondent No.1/wife in her cross-examination had admitted that she is working in Shipob Private Limited Company as a Merchant Care Specialization and getting salary in hand of ₹40,000/- per month and sometimes, she gets salary of ₹50,000/- to ₹60,000/- including overtime work and in this way her income varies from ₹40,000/- to ₹60,000/- per month from the aforesaid private company. However, on the other hand, so far as the petitioner/husband is concerned, he in his cross-examination admitted that he is getting salary of ₹1,25,000/- per month and he is also filing income tax return of ₹20,00,000/- per year. Learned Judge, Family Court observed that a perusal of the bank account of the petitioner as Exhibit-PX shows that the petitioner/husband is getting monthly salary from Caterpillar India Private Limited to the tune of ₹1,03,000/- to ₹1,83,000/- approximately. Furthermore, learned Judge, Family Court also referred to Form-16 for the assessment year 2023-24 of the petitioner/husband and his gross salary is ₹27,23,449/- per annum and as per the ITR, the total income of the petitioner/husband has come out to be ₹21,61,800/- per annum and after deducting income tax of ₹4,80,663/- his net income is ₹16,81,137/- per year and therefore, the income of the petitioner/husband was assessed as



**CRR(F)-970-2025 (O&M)**

**-4-**

₹1,40,000/- per month.

6. In this way, both the petitioner/husband and respondent No.1/wife are having their own source of income. The income of the petitioner/husband has been assessed as ₹1,40,000/- per month whereas the income of respondent No.1/wife has been assessed as ₹40,000/- to ₹60,000/- per month. Respondent No.1/wife has not been granted any maintenance. Respondent No.2/daughter, who is of the age of about 5-6 years, must have started going to the school. The amount of maintenance which has been granted to respondent No.2 is only ₹20,000/- per month from the date of filing of the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. and thereafter, to the tune of ₹25,000/- per month from the date of passing of the judgment of maintenance till her attaining the age of majority. It was the argument of learned counsel for the petitioner that the maintenance granted to the daughter may be reduced in view of the aforesaid argument on proportionality and liability . However, this Court is of the considered view that in case respondent No.1/wife is earning ₹40,000/- to ₹60,000/- per month as per the impugned order, then she also has to take care of her own and to maintain herself because she has not been granted any maintenance and rather she has been denied maintenance by way of the impugned order. It is not a case where the petitioner/husband is having any less income but it has been assessed as ₹1,40,000/- per month. As per the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner/husband is also depositing ₹10,000/- per month in some government scheme for the daughter which according to the learned counsel for the petitioner reflects from the affidavit filed by the petitioner. Still considering the aforesaid income of the petitioner, which has been assessed to the tune of ₹1,40,000/- per month, an amount of ₹20,000/- +

**CRR(F)-970-2025 (O&M)****-5-**

₹10,000/- and thereafter, ₹25,000/- + ₹10,000/- cannot also be said to be on excessive or on the higher side. In today's era, where the cost of living, inflationary tendencies and the place where the parties reside also has to be taken into consideration. The respondents, who is the wife and the daughter are residing in Faridabad which is an industrial town. The age of the girl child is stated to be about 5-6 years. However, from the point of view of future, taking care, education, day-to-day expenses and medical requirements, the aforesaid amount by no stretch of imagination can be said to be on the higher side.

7. Therefore, this Court is of the considered view that there is no illegality or perversity in the impugned order passed by learned Family Court and this Court does not find any ground to interfere in the revisional jurisdiction. Therefore, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

**14.07.2025***Bhumika***(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)  
JUDGE**

- |                               |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable:        | Yes/No |