

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT HYDERABAD
FOR THE STATE OF TELANGANA AND THE STATE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH

-

-
CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.1519 of 2015

Between:

Gonnabakthula Gowri Satya Naga
Mallikharjuna Rao.

...Petitioner

and

Gonnabakthula Sridevi and others. ... Respondents

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: **13.08.2015**

SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:

-
-
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL

- | | |
|--|--------|
| 1. Whether Reporters of Local newspapers
may be allowed to see the Judgments? | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether the copies of judgment may be
marked to Law Reporters/Journals? | Yes/No |
| 3. Whether his Lordship wish to
see the fair copy of the Judgment? | Yes/No |

-
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL

-

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.1519 of 2015

-

ORDER:

This Criminal Revision Case, under Sections 397 and 401 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short, 'Cr.P.C') is filed aggrieved by the order and decree, dated 17.06.2013, in M.C.No.90 of 2009 passed by the Judge, Family Court-cum-IV Additional District & Sessions Judge, Vijayawada.

2. Respondent No.1 is wife and respondent No.2 is daughter of the petitioner. Marriage of the petitioner with respondent No.1 was performed on 20.05.2006 at Kankipadu Village as per their caste custom. Since the date of marriage, the petitioner is harassing respondent No.1 at the instance of his parents and he never allowed her even to talk with her parents. The petitioner neglected and deserted the respondents on 16.04.2009 and he did not provide maintenance to them. Hence, the respondents filed aforesaid M.C. The learned Judge after considering the evidence on record, awarded an amount of Rs.3,000/- per month to respondent No.1 and Rs.2,000/- per month to respondent No.2 towards their maintenance. Aggrieved by the same, the present revision case is filed by the petitioner herein.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that previously the petitioner worked as computer operator, but now he lost his job and he is not in a position to pay the maintenance to the respondents and hence, he prays to reduce the maintenance granted to the respondents.

4. The relationship between the parties is not in dispute. The trial Court after considering the evidence on record, granted an amount of Rs.3,000/- per month to respondent No.1 and Rs.2,000/- per month to respondent No.2 towards their maintenance. Considering the

present day cost of living, the amount granted to the respondents by the Court below towards their maintenance cannot be said to be on higher side. There is no illegality or irregularity in the impugned order passed by the Court below warranting interference by this Court. Therefore, the revision is devoid of merit and the same is liable to be dismissed.

5. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this revision shall stand closed.

M.S.K.JAISWAL,J

AUGUST 13, 2015
YVL

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE M.S.K.JAISWAL

-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.1519 of 2015

Dt: 13.08.2015

YVL