

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL REVISION No. 287 of 2018**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year- Thana- District-

=====

Raj Kishore Prasad, Son of Arjun Ram @ Arjun Pd., resident of Village &  
P.S.- Govindpur, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Madhavi Devi, wife of Raj Kishore Prasad, Daughter of Late Mahendra Prasad, resident of Village- Main Road, Warisaliganj, P.S.- Warisaliganj, District- Nawada.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

|                      |   |                               |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s | : | Mr. Krishna Deo Raj, Advocate |
| For the State        | : | Mr. Nand Kumar, APP           |

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AHSANUDDIN**  
**AMANULLAH**

**ORAL JUDGMENT**

**Date : 04-11-2019**

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned  
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner has moved the Court under Section 19(4) of the Family Courts Act, 1984 against the order dated 12.02.2018, passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, Nawada in Miscellaneous Case No. 12 of 2012, by which the petitioner being the husband of the opposite party no. 2 has been directed to pay Rs. 5,000/- per month maintenance.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the amount is high and that he is ready to keep the opposite party no.



2 and the child with him but she is not ready to come and live with him.

4. Learned APP submitted that an amount of Rs. 5,000/- per month in favour of the wife and the minor daughter is most reasonable and requires no interference. It was further submitted that even if the petitioner earns daily wages, he would be in a comfortable position to pay the meager amount of Rs. 5,000/- to the opposite party no. 2 and his daughter.

5. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties, the Court does not find any occasion to interfere in the matter, especially in view of the quantum which, in the considered opinion of the Court, cannot be termed to be high, much less exorbitant, and in fact, is most appropriate and reasonable.

6. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

**(Ahsanuddin Amanullah, J.)**

P. Kumar

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| AFR/NAFR |  |
| U        |  |
| T        |  |

