

to wife and Rs.4,000/- per month to the daughter. There was no sufficient material before the Trial Court to enhance the maintenance to Rs.7,000/- per month to wife and Rs.5,000/- per month to daughter, especially from the date of application dated 20th July, 2014.

4] According to learned counsel for the petitioner, only in the year 2012, the consent order was passed and within two years, there was no change in the circumstances so as to enhance the amount of maintenance. It is submitted that respondent is also earning income by taking tuitions and she may be called upon to produce her passbook to show her income. She has not done so in the trial Court and hence in this revision, she may be called upon to do so.

5] Needless to state that, this Court in revisional jurisdiction cannot permit additional evidence. Apart from it, it is pertinent to note that in the year 2012, the consent order was passed thereby granting maintenance at the rate of Rs.6,000/- per month to respondent wife and and Rs.4,000/- per month to their daughter. Now from the year 2012 till the year 2014, when the application was filed or till the year 2017 when the order was passed, there is change in the circumstances, like increase in cost of

essential commodities and overall rate of inflation is also increased. Even the development needs of the child are also changing and therefore, they require expenses. In such situation, if the trial Court has enhanced amount of maintenance to wife from Rs.6,000/- per month to Rs.7,000/- and to daughter from Rs.4,000/- per month to Rs.5,000/-, it can hardly be said to be exorbitant or unreasonable so as to warrant interference therein, in the revisional jurisdiction. This enhancement has become necessitated on account of change in the circumstances, during the period of five years.

6] As regards the contention of the petitioner that his job was upto 31st May, 2017, having regard to his qualification that he being basket ball trainer, it does not probable that he will be sitting idle without doing any work, especially when the submission of learned counsel for respondent is that he has performed second marriage also.

7] Hence having regard to the evidence on record and the submissions advanced, revision holds no merit, therefore, stands dismissed.

(DR. SHALINI PHANSALKAR-JOSHI, J.)