

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRR No. 973 of 2016**

- Suresh Sharma S/o Radheshyam Sharma Aged About 32 Years R/o Near Petrol Pump, Station Road Bhatapara, Tahsil Bhatapara, District Raipur (Now Balodabazar - Bhatapara) Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant**Versus**

- Sangeeta Sharma W/o Suresh Sharma Aged About 28 Years D/o Shri Ramavtar Sharma, R/o Ashwani Nagar, Raipur, Tahsil & District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Non-applicant

For Applicant

Shri Sudeep Verma, Advocate

SB: Hon'ble Shri Justice P.Sam Koshy**Order On Board****20.10.2016**

1. The present Revision Petition has been filed assailing the order dated 12.07.2016. passed by the family Court, Raipur in M.J.C. Case No. 255/2008 whereby in a proceeding under section 125 of the CrPC the Court below has awarded an amount of Rs. 1000/- to be paid to the Non-applicant wife as maintenance.
2. The Contention of the Petitioner is that the Court below has not properly appreciated the fact that the Non-applicant wife is working as Aganbadi worker and is getting an income of Rs. 2000/- per month and therefore the Court below should not have granted any further amount to the Non-applicant as maintenance.
3. On perusal of the impugned order it reflects that the submission of the Applicant has also been considered by the Family Court and

Family Court in the course of the adjudicating the said issue reached to the conclusion that the income that the Non-applicant wife was receiving as Aaganbadi worker is only Rs. 2000/- which in todays cost of living is not adequate for maintaining a decent standard of living.

4. Further the Court below has also taken into consideration the income of the present Applicant husband and ordered accordingly so as to maintain a decent standard of living, commensurate to the status of the Applicant husband, the Non-applicant wife was entitled for an amount of Rs. 1000/- as maintenance.
5. Thus, in the opinion of this Court the act on part of the Court below can not be said to be perverse or illegal nor can it be said to be contrary to the evidence which has come on record. Neither can the amount of maintenance granted to Non-applicant wife said to be exorbitant or in any manner on higher side considering the income of the Applicant husband, as also the income of the non-applicant wife as Anganbadi worker.
6. Accordingly, the present Petition being devoid of merits stands rejected.

**Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE**