

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

**Criminal Revision Case No. 322 of 2013**

Between:

Bussa Kavijyothi

.. Petitioner (s)

And

The State of AP., rep. by Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of AP, Hyderabad and another

.. Respondent (s)

DATE OF JUDGMENT PRONOUNCED: 21.07.2015

-

-

**SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL:**

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

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

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

**Criminal Revision Case No. 322 of 2013**

**Order:**

This Criminal Revision Case is directed against the orders, dated 11.01.2013, passed in CrI.MP No. 1390 of 2012 in DVC No. 23 of 2009 by the learned Special Mobile Magistrate, Guntur.

2. Originally, the second respondent herein filed DVC No.23 of 2009 on the file of VI Additional Junior Civil Judge, Guntur, and the learned Junior Civil Judge, by an order dated 24.06.2010, granted the reliefs, which includes payment of monthly maintenance of Rs.1500/- to the second respondent - mother. Against the said orders, the petitioner herein, who is the son of the second respondent, filed CrIMP No.1390 of 2012 in DVC No.23 of 2009 for modification of the said maintenance order and the said petition was dismissed by the impugned order. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has filed the present revision case.

3. The contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the petitioner is a retired employee and he has to maintain his family and the second respondent, who is his mother, is getting pension of Rs.6,000/- per month and the said amount is sufficient for her livelihood and, therefore, directing the petitioner to pay monthly maintenance of Rs.1500/- to the second respondent – mother, is excessive and the second respondent is not entitled to claim any maintenance.

4. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and on perusal of the material on record, I do not think that grant of maintenance of Rs.1500/- per month to the second respondent – mother is in any way excessive or erroneous. Merely because the

second respondent – mother is getting pension, the petitioner – son cannot deny paying monthly maintenance to her. The amount awarded towards maintenance to the second respondent – mother is only Rs.1500/- per month. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, I see no valid grounds to interfere with the impugned order. The Criminal Revision Case is devoid of merit and the same is liable to be dismissed.

5. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed.

6. As a sequel thereto, the miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in the Criminal Revision Case shall stand closed.

---

**M.S.K. JAISWAL, J.**

Date: 21.07.2015

Nsr