

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**

**CRR No. 784 of 2014**

1. Shriram Vijay Sahu S/o Shri Harish Babu Sahu Aged About 28 Years R/o Chandipara, Pamgarh, Tah. And PS Pamgarh, Civil And Rev. Distt. Janjgir - Champa C.G.

**---- Applicant**

**Versus**

1. Smt. Dipika Sahu W/o Shriram Vijay Aged About 24 Years R/o Chandipara, Pamgarh, Tah. And PS Pamgarh, Civil And Rev. Distt. Janjgir - Champa C.G.
2. Kumari Radhika Sahu Aged About 2 Years Through Legal Guardian Mother Smt. Dipika Sahu, W/o Shriram Vijay Sahu, Both By Caste Sahu, R/o Chandipara, Pamgarh, Tah. And Ps Pamgarh, Civil And Rev. Distt. Janjgir - Champa C.G.

**---- Respondents**

---

For applicant:  
For Respondents:

Shri Vivek Singhal Advocate  
Ms. Neha Verma Advocate.

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Pritinker Diwaker**

**Order On Board**

**01/12/2015**

With the consent of the parties, the matter is heard finally.

2. Challenge in the present revision petition is to the order dated 02.08.2014 passed by the Family Court, Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa, awarding the monthly maintenance of Rs. 3,000/- in favour of respondent No.1 (wife) and Rs. 1000/- in favour of respondent No.2 (the minor daughter of the applicant).

3. Counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant is working as Shiksha Karmi Grade – III and gets Rs. 11,000/- per month as salary. He submits that the parents of the applicant are also dependent on him and therefore the maintenance awarded by the Court below in favour of

the respondents is on the higher side. According to the counsel for the applicant, the respondents have failed to file any document in support of their averment that the applicant owns 15 acres of land. Lastly his submission is that the respondent No.1 has left the company of the applicant voluntarily without there being any sufficient reason and for that also she is not entitled to receive any maintenance from him.

4. On the other hand, counsel for the respondents submits that father of the applicant is a retired employee of BALCO and he is not dependent on anyone much less on the applicant. She submits that this apart, the applicant owns sufficient agriculture land and being all this, the amount awarded by the Court below cannot be said to be on the higher side.

5. In the order impugned a categorical finding has been recorded by the Court below that monthly salary of the applicant is Rs. 10,137/-. Most importantly, the present day going-up cost of living is also a universally faced phenomenon and in a case like in hand where apart from wife, a minor daughter is also there to pull on at least as a human being sticking to the minimum, the maintenance amount of Rs. 3,000/- + 1,000/- = 4,000/- cannot be said to be too much. This is absolutely reasonable. Order of the Court below granting maintenance is thus left as it is without making even the slightest meddling with it.

6. Revision is thus made to go being merit-less. Dismissal of-course.

Sd/-

(Pritinker Diwaker)

Judge