


⑤
①
SINGLE BENCH

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPSUR
CRIMINAL REVISION NO. 85 OF 2014

APPLICANT

Udaychand S/o Dulichand, aged about
28 years, R/o Village Gopalpur, Police
Station & Tahsil Khairagarh, Civil &
Revenue District Rajnandgaon C.G.

R.No. 85/14
Presented by Shri ... Dashrath Prasad ...
dated 03/10/2014
AM

(Non-applicant in Family Court)

VERSUS

NON-APPLICANTS

- : 1. Minor Kamalchand S/o Udaychand,
aged about 1 year, caste Lodhi,
through the natural guardian mother
Smt. Sheelu Bai, W/o Udaychand
Lodhi,
2. Smt. Sheelu Bai W/o Udaychand
Lodhi, aged about 24 years,
Both are resident of village Dilippur,
Police Station & Tahsil Khairagarh,
District Rajnandgaon C.G.
(Applicants in Family Court)




CRIMINAL REVISION UNDER SECTION 19 (4) OF THE
FAMILY COURT ACT

Being aggrieved by order passed by the Judge Family
Court Circuit Court Khairagarh, district Rajnandgaon C.G. and
presided over by Shri Nirmal Minz in Miscellaneous Criminal
Case No. 149/2012 "Minor Kamalchand & another Vs.
Udaychand" dated 7.11.2013 whereby the application filed by
non- applicants herein for grant of maintenance has been
allowed and applicant has been directed to pay Rs. 700/- &

5

2

1,000/- respectively to the applicants per month. A copy of order dated 7.11.2013 is annexed herewith as **Annexure C/1**.



HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Single Bench:- Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Criminal Revision No. 85 of 2014

Applicant

Udaychand

VERSUS

Non-applicant

Minor Kamalchand & another

Present: Shri Rakesh Pandey, Advocate with Shri Dashrath Prajapati,
Advocate, counsel for the applicant.
None for the non-applicant though served.

Oral Order
(06.02.2014)

By way of the instant criminal revision, the applicant has challenged the order dated 07.11.2013 passed in Case No 149/2012 by the Judge, Family Court Circuit Court Khairagarh, whereby of the said impugned order dated 7.11.2013 the learned trial court has passed the order of maintenance to the applicant No.1 and the applicant no. 2 at the rate of Rs.700/- and Rs. 1000/- per month respectively.

2. It is this judgement dated 17.11.2013 which has been challenged in the instant revision petition, on due consideration and also facts and circumstances of the case, the evidence that have come on record and after taking into consideration the reasons give by the court below, I am not inclined to interfere with the finding given by the court below at this juncture. The order of maintenance awarded by the court below to the applicant No.1 at the rate of 700/- per month as well as to the Applicant No. 2 at the rate of 1000/- per month is itself a very meager amount calling for any interference at this juncture.

3. For the foregoing reasons also the order passed by the court below does not call for any interference at this stage.

4. In view of the above, the instant criminal revision is dismissed being devoid of merit.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge