

2025:PHHC:100707



CRR(F)-1518-2024 (O&M)

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

(105)

CRR(F)-1518-2024 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-06.08.2025

Savita and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

Rajesh

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN**

\*\*\*\*\*

Present: Mr. Shokeen Singh Verma, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ALOK JAIN, J. (Oral)**

The present petition has been filed raising challenge to the order dated 23.02.2024 passed by the Court below declining the grant of maintenance to the petitioner No. 1-wife and granting a sum of Rs. 8,000/- per month to petitioner No. 2 who is the daughter.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the trial Court has fell in error in dismissing the petition *qua* petitioner No. 1 and has not taken into consideration that the respondent-husband is earning almost Rs. 1,00,000/- per month. Learned counsel further submits that the Court below has not considered the fact that the expenses for bringing up the child are quite high and the living cost in Gurgaon has also increased substantially and therefore, an amount of Rs. 8,000/- is too meager. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that petitioner No. 1 is also



CRR(F)-1518-2024 (O&M)

entitled to same amenities and comforts in life as that of the respondent-husband.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the respondent is working in a Nationalised Bank and is also receiving rental income from the residential house and therefore, the Court below has fell in error in not granting any maintenance to petitioner No. 1.

4. The Court has put a specific query to which learned counsel for the petitioner has very fairly submitted that, in fact, petitioner No. 1 and respondent have already been granted divorce on the ground of cruelty. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that petitioner No. 1 is already in appeal bearing No. FAO-365-2024 before this Court.

5. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner at length.

6. Admittedly, the petitioner No. 1 is also employed as a Constable in Haryana Police though she is under suspension at this stage. Learned counsel for the petitioners has not been able to demonstrate as to how the maintenance granted is on the lower side. Moreover, the divorce was already granted on the ground of cruelty.

7. Be that as it may, while considering the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. the parameters have been laid down in the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case titled as "*Rajneesh Vs. Neha*" (2021) 2 SCC 324, and admittedly, the petitioner No. 1 is earning well to sustain herself.

8. In light of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order has been passed by the learned Court below after considering all the material facts and circumstances and the same is

2025:PHHC:100707



CRR(F)-1518-2024 (O&M)

absolutely legal and valid. Therefore, finding no infirmity or perversity in the same, the present petition stands dismissed.

**(ALOK JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**August 06, 2025**

Parul

|                             |        |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned:- | Yes/No |
| Whether Reportable:-        | Yes/No |