



CGHC010403572026



2026:CGHC:44154

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 1400 of 2026

1 - Poonam Sharma W/o Dharmendra Kumar Sharma, Aged About 41 Years
Petitioner No. 1 To 3 Are R/o Professor Colony, Tehsil And District Raipur
Chhattisgarh.

2 - Ms, Arya Sharma D/o Dharmendra Kumar Sharma Aged About 14 Years
Petitioner No. 2 And 3 Are Minors, Represented Through Their Mother And
Natural Gaurdian Their Mother Smt, Poonam Sharma --R/o Professor Colony,
Tehsil And District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

3 - Arnav Sharma S/o Dharmendra Kumar Sharma Aged About 10 Years
Petitioner No. 2 And 3 Are Minors, Represented Through Their Mother And
Natural Gaurdian Their Mother Smt, Poonam Sharma --R/o Professor Colony,
Tehsil And District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

... Applicants

versus

Dharmendra Kumar Sharma S/o Shri Ramsahay Sharma Aged About 49 Years
R/o Piyush Nagar, Kushalpur P.S. Purani Basti, Tehsil And District Raipur C.G.
Address For Service, Through Block Education Officer, Dharsiwa, District
Raipur C.G. Additional Address Head Master Middle, School Bhathagaon,
District Raipur Chhattisgarh.

...Non-applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Shalvik Tiwari, Advocate

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

13/10/2026

Heard.

1. The instant criminal revision has been preferred by the applicants under
Section 19(4) of the Family Courts Act, 1984, seeking exercise of revisional

jurisdiction against the order dated 28.09.2026 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Raipur (C.G.) in MCC No. 88/2026, whereby; (i) the applicants' application under Order XI Rule 12 CPC for disclosure of the respondent's income and of the amounts paid by him, and (ii) applicants' application under Section 151 CPC for hearing MCC No.88/2026 together with MJC No. 1042/2026, have been rejected.

2. Learned counsel for the applicants would submit that vide order dated 24.12.2019 passed by the Family Court, Raipur in MJC No.504/2019 (Smt. Poonam Sharma & Ors. Vs. Dharmendra Kumar Sharma), Rs.6,000/- and Rs.4,000/- respectively monthly maintenance was granted in favour of applicant No.2-Ms. Arya Sharma and applicant No.3-Arn timer Sharma. He would further submit that respondent (father of applicants No.2 & 3 herein) filed modification application in aforesaid order under Section 146 of BNSS, 2023 on 29.08.2026, which is pending consideration before Principal Judge, Family Court, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.). He would further submit that applicants No.2 & 3 (daughter and son) have also filed application under Section 146 of BNSS, for enhancement of maintenance amount granted to them. Therefore, applicants No.2 & 3 herein filed application under Section 151 of CPC, which has been registered as MCC No.88/2026 and MCC No.1042/2026 before Principal Judge, Family Court, Raipur. He would further submit that applicants No.2 & 3 (daughter and son) filed application to link both the cases as ultimate result of both the cases would be common, but learned Family Court, Raipur has rejected the application filed by applicants No. 2 & 3 herein on the ground that vide order dated 05.08.2026 passed by

this Court in CrMP No.2057/2026, Case No.88/2026 filed by respondent/husband, has been directed to be decided within two months. He would further submit that since issue to be considered in both the cases are similar. Hence, impugned order be set aside and Family Court, Raipur be directed to link together both the cases, i.e., MCC No.88/2026 and MCC No.1042/2026 and to decide jointly.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the applicants and perused the material available on record.
4. Upon perusal of Annexure P-3, filed by the applicants under Section 146 of the BNSS, it appears that they are seeking enhancement of the maintenance amount awarded in favour of applicants No. 2 and 3 herein. However, upon perusal of Annexure P-2, filed by the respondent (husband/father of applicants No. 2 and 3), it appears that he is seeking quashing of the application filed by the non-applicants therein (the applicants herein) under Section 144 of the BNSS. Thus, the reliefs sought by the respective parties, as reflected in the aforesaid applications, are distinct and contradictory in nature. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, this Court is not inclined to entertain the instant revision petition.
5. Accordingly, this revision stands rejected.
6. However, it is observed that both parties are seeking modification of order dated 24.12.2019 passed by the Family Court, Raipur, in Case No. 504/2019. In such situation, even if this Court has directed the Family Court to decide the case filed by the respondent/husband within a period of two months, the

Family Court may seek an extension of time for disposal of the matter, having regard to the nature of the reliefs sought by both parties.

Sd/-
(Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)
Judge

Vasant