

Amk

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**WRIT PETITION NO. 1632 OF 2016**

Mr. Suryabhan @ Suresh Dadabhau Pawar .. Petitioner  
Vs.  
Smt. Sadhana Suryabhan @ Suresh Pawar .. Respondents

Mr. Kunal Bhanage a/w. Mr. Akshay Pawar for the Petitioner.  
Mr. Sandeep Barve a/w. Mr. Santosh Wagh, Mr. Preshit Bagul i/b B. K. Barve & Co. for the Respondent.

**CORAM : A. S. GADKARI, J.**  
**DATE : 18<sup>th</sup> AUGUST, 2017.**

**P. C. :**

1. By the present petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has impugned the order dated 24.08.2015 passed by the Family Court No.5, Mumbai allowing the application of the respondent/wife filed under Section 125 of the Criminal Procedure Code. By the impugned order, the Family Court No.5, Mumbai has directed the petitioner to pay Rs.1,500/- to the respondent/wife towards interim maintenance from the date of filing of the application. By Maharashtra Amendment to Section 125 of Cr. P.C. the words "500 rupees" have been replaced by words "1500 rupees". The Legislature after taking into consideration the inflation in the cost of living has incorporated the said words by effecting amendment in the said section. The Trial Court after taking into consideration the material available before it has passed the

impugned order, directing the petitioner to pay the minimum possible amount to the respondent.

2. After taking into consideration the entire material available on record, this Court is of the view that the Family Court has not committed any error or illegality while passing impugned order.

3. Petition being devoid of merits is accordingly rejected.

**[A. S. GADKARI, J.]**