

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR

THURSDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/28TH KARTHIKA, 1937

RPFC.No. 305 of 2014 ()

MC 469/2012 of FAMILY COURT, NEDUMANGAD

REVISION PETITIONER(S)/RESPONDENT:

K.VISAKH
S/O.KESAVAN NAMPOOTHIRI, KOYIKKAL PUTHEN MADAM
SOUTH EAST THAZHAVA, THAZHAVA VILLAGE, KARUNAGAPPALLY
SRP MARKET P.O., KOLLAM -690 539.

BY ADVS.SRI.K.SIJU
SMT.BINDU GEORGE
SMT.S.SEETHA

RESPONDENT(S)/PETITIONER:

ASHA M.K, AGED 23 YEARS
D/O.KALA DEVI S, MANKOTTUKONATHU MADAM
ARUVIKKARA P.O., KARAKULAM
THIRUVANNATHAPURAM - 695 064.

. BY ADV. SRI.A.RAJASIMHAN
. BY ADV. SRI.K.NIRMALAN

THIS REV.PETITION(FAMILY COURT) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON
19-11-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR, J.

R.P.(F.C.) No.305 of 2014

Dated this the 19th day of November 2015

O R D E R

The revision petitioner is the respondent in M.C. No.469 of 2012 on the files of the Family Court, Nedumangadu. The revision petitioner was directed by the court below to pay Rs.5,000/- per month to the respondent towards her maintenance.

2. Heard.

3. The status of the respondent as the wife of the revision petitioner is not disputed. The only challenge in this revision petition is with regard to the quantum of maintenance awarded by the court below. The revision

petitioner admitted that he is getting a salary of Rs.18,000/- per month. There is no material before the court to show that PW1 is having any job or source of income for her livelihood. PW1 specifically stated that she is not having any job or other source of income for her livelihood. The evidence of CPW1 would show that he is not having any other obligation. He has also not married any other person. Taking into consideration of the cost of living, the status of the parties, the needs of the respondent and the income of the revision petitioner, the court below directed the revision petitioner to pay the maintenance as stated above. No circumstance has been brought to my notice to indicate that the quantum of maintenance ordered by the court below is exorbitant or unreasonable. Having gone through

the order impugned, I do not find any infirmity in the order impugned warranting interference by this Court.

In the result, this revision petition stands dismissed.

The revision petitioner is granted two months to pay the arrears of maintenance as requested by the learned counsel for the revision petitioner.

Sd/-

**B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR,
JUDGE**

dl/23.11...2015

// True Copy //

PA to Judge