



(1)

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

FAO-4751-2025 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 04.08.2025

Major Singh

...Appellant

Versus

Sukhwinder Kaur

...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL**

Present: Ms. Swati Verma, Advocate, for the appellant.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J.

1. Appellant – Major Singh assails order dated 18.10.2024 vide which learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Ajnala (Camp Court) while accepting an application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act has awarded interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.5000/- per month from the date of filing of application.
2. The matter arises out of a petition under Section 13 of the Hindu Marriage Act filed by respondent – Sukhwinder Kaur seeking dissolution of her marriage primarily on the ground that she was aged barely 15/16 years at the time of her marriage and had been forcibly married off by his uncle & aunt to appellant – Major Singh, who was aged about 45 years and was a divorcee and that the said facts were never disclosed to her. Another ground raised therein is cruelty being met out to respondent/wife. Respondent/wife also moved an application seeking grant of interim maintenance averring therein that she was unable to maintain herself and was dependent upon her parents for her upkeep. While respondent/wife alleged that the appellant/husband was earning Rs.30,000/- per month by selling milk, the appellant/husband in his



(2)

counter affidavit rather took a stand that respondent/wife herself was earning Rs.10,000/- per month by doing household work in the house of one Jaidev Bhandari.

3. The Family Court while assessing the income of the appellant/husband being an able bodied person between Rs.15,000/- - Rs.18,000/- awarded monthly interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.5000/- per month.
4. Learned counsel for the appellant/husband submitted that the monthly interim maintenance awarded by the Family Court is on the higher side given the fact that the respondent/wife herself was earning Rs.10,000/- per month.
5. There is nothing on record to substantiate the stand of the appellant/husband that the respondent/wife herself was earning Rs.10,000/- per month. In any case, the appellant being an able bodied person can safely be said to be earning at least Rs.15,000/- - Rs.18,000/- per month, as has been rightly observed by the Family Court. We do not find any reason to differ with the said observation. Under these circumstances, the trial Court having awarded monthly interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.5000/- per month cannot be said to have committed any error. The quantum certainly cannot be said to be on the excessive side so as to warrant any interference.
6. Consequently, we do not find any infirmity in the impugned order and the same is hereby upheld. Finding no merit in the instant appeal, the same is hereby dismissed.

(GURVINDER SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

04.08.2025

Vimal

(RUPINDERJIT CHAHAL)
JUDGE

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