



CGHC010197802025

2026:CGHC:37117

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 639 of 2025

Smt. Sumanlata Patel W/o Tikam Singh Patel Aged About 29 Years R/o C/o Mohit Ram Patel, At Present R/o Village Kaudia, P.S. Seepat, Tahsil Seepat, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

versus

Tikam Singh Patel S/o Nohar Singh Patel Aged About 29 Years R/o Village Seepat, Near Little Bird School, Nawadih Chowk, P.S. Seepat, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents



For Applicant	: Mr. Rustam Sahu, Advocate.
For Respondent	: Ms. Seema Verma, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

19.08.2026

1. Heard Mr. Rustam Sahu, learned counsel for the applicant. Also heard Ms. Seema Verma, learned counsel for the respondent.
2. This Criminal Revision is being aggrieved of the order dated 21.04.2025 passed by the learned Family Court, Bilaspur, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) in Misc. Cr. Case No. 1139/2022, whereby the learned Family Court, dismissed the application under Section 125 of CrPC filed by the applicant for grant of maintenance.
3. The prosecution story in brief is that the applicant had filed an application under Section 125 of CrPC for seeking maintenance amount of Rs. 30,000/- per month from the respondent, and it is admitted fact that the applicant and respondent had solemnized

marriage according to Hindu Rites and Rituals Custom on 17.06.2021. The applicant has claimed in briefly is that after marriage, the applicant was peacefully happily residing with her husband respondent at her matrimonial house and after some time of marriage, the respondent was harassed and tortured with the applicant by physically and mental cruelty in the name of less than dowry and has illegal demanded money amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- for motorcycle and the respondent does not like to the applicant for living together and respondent has get out to the applicant from her matrimonial house by committing marpeet due to harassed and mentally tortured, she has left from her matrimonial house and is living at her parental house. The applicant is legally wedded wife of the Respondent and she has no any source of income for livelihood and respondent is working as contractor in N.T.P.C. Seepat District Bilaspur and on account of his work, he has obtained amount of Rs. 15-20,000/- per month income and also having agricultural land area 5 acre and on account of this, he obtained amount of Rs. 2-3 lacs annual income and also given house 15-16 room for rent and on account of this, he has received 50,000/- per month income and hence the applicant has filed application under section 125 of CrPC for seeking a maintenance amount of Rs. 30,000/- per month against the respondent.

4. The respondent herein has filed the reply to the said application and has denied the averments raised by the applicant. The learned Family Court has recorded the statement of the parties. The witnesses were examined before the learned Family Court including the applicant and the respondent. The learned Family Court by passing the impugned order, has dismissed the application under Section 125 of CrPC filed

by the applicant for grant of maintenance. Hence, this revision.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the impugned order is contrary to the facts, law and circumstances of this case. It is further submitted that the applicant was being ill treated and mentally harassed by the respondent, which made the applicant to live separately from the respondent and the same is sufficient ground for a wife to live separately. Therefore, the impugned order is contrary to the facts, and the same is liable to be set aside.
6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent opposes the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant and supports the impugned order dated 21.04.2025 passed by the learned Family Court, Bilaspur, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) in Misc. Cr. Case No. 1139/2022, whereby the learned Family Court, dismissed the application under Section 125 of CrPC filed by the applicant for grant of maintenance, and she further submits that there is no illegality and infirmity while passing the same.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the pleadings and documents appended thereto.
8. Considering the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties, and from the perusal of the order of the Family Court, it transpires that no any good ground has been raised on merits by the applicants' side, thus, it transpires that after hearing all the statements of the witnesses and perusing the evidence available on record, the learned Family Court has passed the impugned order, and there is no any illegality and infirmity while passing the same which requires interference by this Court.

9. Accordingly, the criminal revision being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby **rejected**.
10. Let a certified copy of this order as well as original records be transmitted to the concerned trial Court for necessary compliance and follow up action, if any.

**Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice**

Rajshekhar