



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-08-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ABDUL QUDDHOSE

**C.R.P. No. 3927 of 2025 and
C.M.P.No.20605 of 2025**

R.Nitin Kumar
S/o.Ranghunathan, No.7/2A, Venkateshwara
Street, Mudichur Road,
Tambaram,
Chennai -600 045.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. N.Karthika
W/o.R.Nitin Kumar, No.42/34, PedduNaicken
Street, Kondithopre,
Washermanpet,
Chennai -600 021.

2. Minor N.Roshan,
Rep. his Mother and next Friend, N.Karthika,
W/o.R.Nitin Kumar, No.42/34, Puddu Naicken
Street, Kondithopre, Washermanpet,
Chennai -600 021.

..Respondent(s)

Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India praying to set aside the order dated 15.03.2025 passed in I.A.No.2 of 2024 in O.P.No.2248 of 2023 pending before the IV Additional Family Court, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.V.Udayakumar

For Respondent(s): No Appearance

**ORDER**

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the impugned order dated 15.03.2025, passed by the IV Additional Principal Family Court, Chennai in I.A.No.2 of 2024 in O.P.No.2248 of 2023.

2. In the aforesaid order, the petitioner who is the husband has been directed to pay a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month as interim maintenance to the respondents.

3. The 1st respondent is the wife and the 2nd respondent is the minor son born out of the wedlock between the petitioner and the 1st respondent. The petitioner contends that the 1st respondent is having her own source of income and therefore the amount of Rs.15,000/- per month fixed by IV Additional Principal Family Court, Chennai as interim maintenance payable by the petitioner to the respondents is excessive. However, as seen from the impugned order, there is no documentary evidence produced by the petitioner before the Family Court to prove that the 1st respondent is having her own source of income. The Family Court has only fixed interim maintenance at a reasonable sum of Rs.15,000/- per month which covers both the 1st respondent viz., the petitioner's wife and the 2nd respondent who is the minor child, born out of the wedlock between the petitioner and the 1st respondent. Even though the learned counsel for the petitioner during the course of his submission had placed before



WEB COPY

this Court a document, which according to him establishes that the 1st respondent is employed and is earning money by way of salary, the said document was not placed on record by the petitioner before the Family Court. Therefore, the said document cannot be considered by this Court at this stage in this Civil Revision Petition. Since a sum of Rs.15,000/- fixed by the Family Court under the impugned order as interim maintenance, both to the 1st respondent as well as the 2nd respondent, this Court is of the considered view that the said sum fixed by the Family Court cannot be considered to be excessive as claimed by the petitioner in this Civil Revision Petition.

4. Since there is no infirmity in the impugned order, this Court does not find any merit in this Civil Revision Petition. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

06-08-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
arr

To

The IV Additional Family Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRP No. 3927 of 2



ABDUL QUDDHOSE, J.

arr

C.R.P No. 3927 of 2025

06-08-2026



WEB COPY

CRP No. 3927 of 2

