



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR(F) No.1249 of 2025(O&M)

Date of Order:28.08.2025

Hari Parkash Singh

.Petitioner

Versus

Garima Kalia

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

**Present: Mr. Varun Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioner.**

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE

1. Order dated 04.06.2025, of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Jalandhar, has been challenged in this revision petition. Vide impugned order, learned Principal Judge, Family Court, awarded a sum of Rs.6000/- per month to the respondent-wife, besides Rs.7000/- as litigation expenses.

2. The only submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that quantum of interim maintenance had been wrongly assessed. It has been argued that petitioner was only earning Rs.10,000/- per month as disclosed by him in his affidavit of income, assets and liabilities and the award of Rs.6,000/- per month to the respondent-wife was excessive.

3. Undisputedly, petitioner is a Mechanical Engineer, he also possesses a degree of MBA. As it transpires from order dated 04.06.2025, the respondent/wife could not produce any document to prove her claim that petitioner-husband was earning Rs.50,000/- per month, however, considering the qualifications of the petitioner, learned trial court concluded that his income was not less than Rs.15,000/- per month, even if he was



taken to be a skilled worker.

4. It is nobody's case that the respondent-wife has any source of income or movable or immovable property. She depends solely on the petitioner-husband for her maintenance. She is entitled to maintenance as would enable her to maintain a standard of living, modesty consistent with the status of the petitioner-husband. The sum awarded must be enough to make a provision for her food, clothing, shelter and medical treatment etc.

5. Considering the educational qualifications of the petitioner-husband and his status in life, learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Jalandhar, has taken an extremely conservative view to assess interim maintenance amount at Rs.6,000/- per month.

6. The assessment is by no means excessive. There is no illegality or perversity in the order under challenge, requiring interference in this revision petition.

7. Hence, dismissed.

8. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of.

(SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL)
JUDGE

28th August, 2025
nt

Whether speaking/reasoned : **Yes/No**
Whether reportable : **Yes/No**