

17.08.2026
Item Nos.17 & 18
Ct. No.652
KS

C.O. 3916 of 2025
Smt. Sangeeta Chakraborty
Vs.
Rajesh Sharma
With
C.O. 2702 of 2025
Rajesh Sharma
Vs.
Smt. Sangeeta Chakraborty

Mr. Sourav Sen, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Subhashis Pacchal
Mr. Siraj Gooptu
Mr. S. Sen
Mr. A. Das

.....For the Petitioner
(C.O. 3916 of 2025)
.....For the Respondent
(C.O. 2702 of 2025)

Mr. Sayak Chakraborty
Mr. Wrickbrata Roy

.....For the Petitioner
(C.O. 2702 of 2025)
.....For the Respondent
(C.O. 3916 of 2025)

1. The parties have been represented today.
2. Both the revisional applications arise out of the matrimonial dispute between the parties.
3. It appears from the records and submissions made by the respective learned advocates for the parties that the matrimonial dispute between the parties is a long standing one. Once, the Court had sent the parties for mediation and settlement of their dispute; however, the mediation has failed.
4. At present, in terms of Court's order, the husband is regularly paying the amount of maintenance of an aggregate of Rs.1,00,000/- per month, to the wife.

5. The wife is aggrieved with the quantum of maintenance granted in her favour by the Court, the primary reason, therefor, according to her, is that the actual income of the husband, which she says has been suppressed by the husband before the Court happens to be far more, than has been declared by him in Court and ultimately considered by the Court, to quantify the maintenance. This submission of wife has been strongly objected to on behalf of the husband.
6. The Court has carefully gone through the records as well as considered the submissions made by the respective parties. It appears that the wife being dissatisfied with the amount of maintenance and on the allegation of suppression of material fact regarding income by the husband, seeks intervention by this Court to the order of the learned Trial Court.
7. However, in considered view of this Court, there is no scope for this revisional Court to do the same, which is only to look into the jurisdictional error, if any, by the learned Trial Court in passing the order under challenge. On the contrary, the Court finds that for enhancement of maintenance, the concerned party would have sufficiently guarded by the appropriate statutory provision to espouse her grievance before the learned Trial Court itself.

8. For the reasons as above, no cogent ground is found to interfere into the order, as challenged in these revisions by the wife as well as the husband.
9. Hence, the revisional application being, C.O. 3916 of 2025 and C.O. 2702 of 2025 stand disposed of.
10. However, let this Court request the learned Trial Court to make all possible endeavour for disposal of this matrimonial suit, now pending before it, as expeditiously as possible, without granting unnecessary adjournment to any of the parties before it.
11. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be furnished to the parties expeditiously upon compliance of all legal formalities.

(RAI CHATTOPADHYAY, J.)