



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

CRR(F)-867-2025 (O & M)

Date of Decision: 02.06.2025

Kahna Ram

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Chander Kala and another

....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present: Mr. Rhythm Bajaj, Advocate,
for the petitioner (appearing through video conferencing).

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant revision petition is seeking setting aside of order dated 16.04.2025 whereby respondent has been awarded interim maintenance of Rs.13,000/- per month. The order dated 16.04.2025 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Camp Court, Abohar reads as under:-

“Costs paid. Today the case was fixed for report of compromise or in the alternative, for arguments on application for interim maintenance. However, the learned counsel for respondent has suffered statement to the effect that his client has no objection if interim maintenance for applicants is fixed Rs.13,000-per month.

Thereafter, applicant No.1 Chander Kala for herself and on behalf of applicant No.2 has suffered statement to the effect that if the interim maintenance of applicants of Rs.13,000/- for both the applicants from the date of filing the present application till the decision of present case. She has also heard the statement of counsel



for respondent and accordingly, order may be passed. She agrees to accept the interim maintenance of Rs.13,000/- per month.

Heard. In the light of statements suffered by counsel for the respondent as well as applicant No.1, the application for interim maintenance stands disposed off with the direction to the respondent to pay Rs.13,000/- per month to both the applicants from the date of filing the present application till the disposal of main application.

Now to come up on 02.07.2025 for evidence of the applicants Payment of interim maintenance be also paid on the date fixed.”

2. On being confronted with aforesaid order, learned counsel for the petitioner expressed his inability to controvert the fact that impugned order has been passed on the basis of consent of counsel for the petitioner.

3. As impugned order is a consent order and further an interim order, this Court does not find it appropriate to interfere in the impugned order.

4. Dismissed.

5. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

02.06.2025
shivani

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking
Whether reportable

Yes
No