

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.9430 of 2015**

=====

Vijay Kumar Singh, S/O Shri Ram Bahadur Singh, resident of Plot No.13,  
Block-A, Goyala Vihar, Najafgarh, New Delhi- 110071

.... .... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar, through Principal Secretary, Department of Law,  
Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. Smt. Seema Singh, daughter of Late Ramanuj Singh, resident of Vill.  
Berawan, P.O.- Salempur, Dist. Nalanda

.... .... Respondents

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ambuj Nayan Chaubey

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kumar Priyaranjan- Sc23

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MUNGESHWAR**  
**SAHOO**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      22-04-2016                      Heard learned counsel, Mr. Ambuj Narayan  
Chaubey, on behalf of the petitioner.

By the order dated 13.04.2015, the learned  
Principal Judge, Family Court, Vaishali at Hajipur in Divorce  
Case No. 303 of 2012 only directed the husband petitioner to pay  
maintenance of Rs. 3000 per month under Section 24 of the  
Hindu Marriage Act and Rs. 10,000/- lump sum amount towards  
the litigation cost.

According to learned counsel for the petitioner, the  
petitioner, no doubt, was a teacher in Delhi but on the day of  
passing the order, he has already left the private job, but the Court  
below only noticed the submission of the petitioner and without

recording finding directed the petitioner to pay Rs. 3000 per month.

The learned counsel further submitted that in support of his case the petitioner desires that he may be permitted to adduce evidence.

It may be mentioned here that only Rs. 3000/- has been directed to be paid by the petitioner to the wife. Therefore, if the petitioner is desirous of producing his evidence in support of the income, the parties are at liberty to file an application before the Court below and after filing application, the same may be decided by the Court below on the basis of the evidence. So far payment of Rs. 3000/- is concerned, the same cannot be interfered with in supervisory jurisdiction. The petitioner till further order is passed by the Court below shall go on paying the amount. Thus, this writ application is dismissed.

**(Mungeshwar Sahoo, J)**

Mishra/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|