



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR(F) No.1207 of 2025(O&M)

Date of Order:22.08.2025

Gagandeep Singh

.Petitioner

Versus

Taranpreet Kaur

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL

Present: Mr. Manpreet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

SHALINI SINGH NAGPAL, JUDGE

CRM-32978 of 2025

1. For the reasons mentioned in the application, which is supported by an affidavit, the delay of 170 days in filing the revision petition is condoned.

2. CM stands disposed of.

CRR(F) No.1207 of 2025

3. Order dated 03.12.2024, of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridkot, has been challenged in this revision petition. Vide impugned order, learned Principal Judge, Family Court, awarded interim maintenance of Rs.4000/- per month to the respondent-wife from the date of filing the main petition and Rs.1500/- towards litigation expenses.

4. The solitary argument of learned counsel for the petitioner is that respondent was qualified, B.Ed. and was earning well from tuitions etc, whereas the petitioner was presently earning only Rs.15,000/-. Besides, he was paying EMIs of car loan, home loan and scooter loan, therefore, the



award of maintenance by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Faridkot, deserves to be set aside.

5. Petitioner has not disputed his relationship with the respondent. In his affidavit of Assets and Liabilities filed before Family Court, he disclosed his occupation as “taxi driver” and his income as Rs.50,000/- per month. Though, he claimed that he was to pay installments of car loan, home loan, scooter loan and phone, it is fairly well settled that maintenance cannot be avoided on the pretext that the husband has taken upon himself financial liabilities. Though, no plea appears to have been raised before the learned Principal Judge, Family Court that wife is well qualified and earning well, it is by now settled that even if wife is earning, it cannot be operate as bar for claiming maintenance. In any case, no such material appears to have been produced before the learned Principal Judge, Family Court. A meagre amount of Rs.4,000/- per month has been awarded as interim maintenance to the respondent which is barely sufficient to keep her body and soul together.

6. The argument that petitioner was earning only Rs.15,000/- is against petitioner's own affidavit of Assets and Liabilities and has no legs to stand on. 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

22nd August, 2025

nt

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