

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**FAM No. 59 of 2016**

Ajay @ Golu Dewangan, aged about 25 years, son of Shri Jairam Dewangan,
R/o Budhwari Bazar, Birgaon, Tahsil and District Raipur (C.G.... **Appellant.**

Versus

1. Smt. Kiran @ Arti Dewangan, aged about 22 years, D/o Brijbhan Dewangan
2. Brijbhan Dewangan, aged about 58 years, Son of late P.N.Dewangan,
3. Smt. Hemin @ Mantora, aged about 54 years, wife of Brijbhan Dewangan,
4. Hemant Dewangan, aged about 30 years, son of Brijbhan Dewangan,
No.1 to 4 re R/o Near Electrical Office, Ekta Nagar, Bhilai-3, District Durg (C.G.)
5. Naresh Kumar @ Naru, aged about 35 years, R/o Naresh Kirana Store, Bazar
Chowk, Bhilai-3, District Durg (C.G.) Mob.No.9907105131, 9302687505,
9907515305
6. Smt. Lata Dewangan, wife of Naresh Dewangan, aged about 32 years, R/o
Ganji Nagar, Birgaon, Tahsil and District Raipur (C.G.), Mob.No.9981929495.
... **Respondents**

For appellant : Shri C.R. Sahu, Advocate

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Pritinker Diwaker &
Hon'ble Shri Justice I.S.Uboweja, JJ.**

Order On Board By P. Diwaker, J.

10/03/2016

Heard on admission.

Challenge in the present appeal is to the order dated 11.02.2016 passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, Raipur, allowing the application as filed by respondent No.1 under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act and granting Rs.3000/- per month towards maintenance pendente lite and expenses for proceedings in favour of respondent No.1.

Counsel for the appellant submits that respondent No.1 is a schizophrenic lady and her marriage was solemnized with the appellant by suppressing this fact, and therefore, she is not entitled for maintenance pendente lite.

We have heard counsel for the appellant.

Whether respondent No.1 was suffering from any disease is a matter of evidence and at this stage we cannot record any finding to that effect. The Court below, after considering all the aspects of the case, was justified in awarding Rs.3000/- per month as maintenance pendente lite and likewise in awarding expenses for proceedings in favour of respondent No.1.

The appeal has no substance and the same is dismissed at the motion stage itself.

Sd/-

(Pritinker Diwaker)
Judge

Sd/-

(I. S. Uboweja)
Judge