

ORDER SHEET
IN THE ISLAMABAD HIGH COURT, ISLAMABAD.
JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

W.P. No.3931-2018

Siyal Khan

Vs.

Mst. Sadia Fageer etc.

S. No. of order/ proceedings	Date of order/ Proceedings	Order with signature of Judge and that of parties or counsel where necessary.
	07.09.2021	Hafiz Farman Ullah, Advocate for petitioner. Ch. Adnan Qamar, Advocate for respondents No.1 to 5.

Respondent No.1 filed a suit for recovery of maintenance for herself and minor children namely respondent Nos.2 to 5 along with dower in shape of 15-tola gold. The said suit was decreed in favour of respondent Nos.1 to 5 vide judgment dated 25.01.2018. The petitioner appealed before respondent No.6 and the said appeal was dismissed vide judgment dated 25.09.2018 and under the same, respondent No.1 was held to be entitled for recovery of maintenance for the period of Iddat @ Rs.8000 per month and for respondent Nos.2 to 5, sum of Rs.6000 each per month and claim to the extent of 15-tola gold, was turned down, hence the petition.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contended that grant of maintenance to the children @ Rs.6000 per month is exorbitant and not in line with the evidence. When confronted as to misreading or non-reading of evidence or any legal flaw with respect to judgment for grant of maintenance, learned counsel for the petitioner was unable to point out any.

3. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.1 to 5 *inter alia* contended that petitioner has not paid single penny towards maintenance.

4. Arguments advanced by learned counsel for the parties have been heard and the documents, placed on record, examined with their able assistance.

5. The facts, leading to filing of instant petition, have been mentioned hereinabove therefore need not be reproduced.

6. The judgment of the learned appellate court is well reasoned, as same provides cogent grounds for fixation of maintenance as well as turning down the claim of petitioner for return of 15-tola gold. Learned counsel for the petitioner was unable to point out any infirmity in the impugned judgment, which as stated above, is well reasoned and does not suffer from any error of law or jurisdiction.

7. For what has been stated above, instant petition is without merit and is accordingly dismissed.

(AAMER FAROOQ)
JUDGE