



CRR(F)-702-2025(O&M)

- 1-

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

112

CRR(F)-702-2025(O&M)

Date of Decision: 12.05.2025

Rajan Bedi

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

Neha Bedi

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present:- Mr. Amandeep Singh Manaise, Advocate for the petitioner.

KIRTI SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been preferred against order dated 25.02.2025 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Hoshiarpur, in the proceedings under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C., whereby ad-interim maintenance of Rs.12,000/- per month was awarded in favour of the respondent-wife.

2. The brief facts of the case are that the marriage between the petitioner and the respondent was solemnised on 09.11.2020. A matrimonial dispute ensued between the couple and the respondent filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. for seeking maintenance. The petitioner filed a reply and contested the claim made by the respondent. The learned Family Court vide order dated 25.02.2025 granted interim maintenance of Rs.12,000/- per month in favour of the respondent. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has approached this Court by filing the present petition.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Hoshiarpur has wrongly allowed the interim maintenance to the respondent which is on a very higher side and it has been passed totally on the basis of wrong facts. The petitioner tried his best to maintain the respondent but she left the company of the petitioner without any just cause. The respondent is an educated and qualified lady who is engaged in tuition work and earning Rs.30,000/- per month whereas the petitioner is working as Salesman in OPP and earning a modest income. He further submits that learned Family Court misread the IP address written on ITR of the petitioner for the year 2024-25 as being his annual income of Rs.2,50,135/-. It is further stated that as per the salary certificate (Annexure P-7), the monthly income of the petitioner is shown to be Rs.13,120/- and his ITR shows his annual income to the tune of Rs.1,68,610/- but the learned Family Court has misread this figure as Rs.2,50,135/- which was the IP address mentioned under the ITR. To substantiate his averments, learned counsel has placed reliance upon Annexure P-7 and P-8.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and after perusing the record with his able assistance, this Court finds merit in the arguments advanced by learned counsel for the petitioner. The present petition is decided *in limine* in order to save litigation cost of the respondent and also to save the judicial time of the Court.

5. A perusal of the impugned order passed by the learned

**CRR(F)-702-2025(O&M)****- 3-**

Family Court reveals that the Court erroneously considered the IP address, i.e., 2.50.134.72, mentioned in the Income Tax Return (ITR), as the annual income of the petitioner, instead of taking into account his actual disclosed income of Rs.1,68,610/- and consequently, ad interim maintenance was awarded. The order dated 25.02.2025 is, therefore, remanded to the learned Family Court for a fresh decision in light of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner. However, it is clarified that until a fresh determination is made regarding interim maintenance, the petitioner shall continue to pay maintenance as directed vide order dated 25.02.2025.

6. The petition is disposed of accordingly.

7. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, also stand(s) disposed of.

12.05.2025
Kapil

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No