

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.03.2016

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE DR.JUSTICE P.DEVADASS

CRL.R.C.No.431 of 2016
and
Crl.M.P.No.2862 of 2016

S.Kuppan

... Revision Petitioner

Vs.

Vannakili

... Respondent

Criminal Revision Case filed under Sections 397 and 401 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to set aside the order passed in F.C.Cr.M.P.No.72 of 2014, dated 16.12.2015 on the file of the learned Family Court Judge, Dharmapuri.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Sudhakar

For respondent : --

ORDER

In this revision, an husband is against the Trial Court order increasing the maintenance to his wife from Rs.500/- per month to Rs.3000/- per month.

2. Originally, in 1999, in a M.C. case, the Magistrate fixed monthly maintenance at Rs.500/- per month. Due to change of circumstances, she sought for increase of the same under section 127 Cr.P.C. The Court below hiked it to Rs.3000/- per month. This is not liked by her husband. That is how this revision.

3. It is contended by the learned counsel for the revision petitioner/husband, the increase is very much. The Revision Petitioner has to take care of his other family members. The impugned order suffers from legality.

4. I have anxiously considered the arguments of the learned counsel for the revision petitioner and perused the

impugned order and the materials on record and the grounds of revision .

5. Now, it is too late for the revision petitioner to deny the legal status of the respondent. In 1999, Rs.500/- per month was fixed. Now, we are in 2016. In the interregnum, there is manifold increase of even essential commodities. There by high inflation. Falling down of prices of even essential commodities is distant dream of every one. In the circumstances, Rs.500/- p.m. will be hard to mouth only. It should be increased.

6. Petitioner is a fitter in Southern Railways. There is increase in salaries, D.A. of Government servants. It is little bit more in the case of Central Government servants. Besides salary, Railway employees are entitled to certain other benefits.

7. Now, Rs.3000/-p.m towards food, roof and for necessities of life including cosmetics, will not be much more. It is neither less nor more. In the circumstances, there is no need to interfere with the impugned order.

8. Thus, this revision fails and it is hereby dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

Sd/-
Assistant Registrar(CS IV)

//True Copy//

Sub Assistant Registrar

vrc

To

The Judge,
Family Court,
Dharmapuri.

WEB COPY

Cr1.R.C.No.431 of 2016
&
Cr1.M.P.No.2862 of 2016

SNS (CO)
CA(30/03/2016)