

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Criminal Revision No. 412 of 2019**

1. Smt. Ishwari Sahu @ Kirtan Sahu, aged about 26 years, W/o Rakesh Sahu,
2. Roshan Sahu, aged about 6 years S/o Rakesh Sahu, minor, represented through mother Smt. Ishwari Sahu @ Kirtan Sahu,

Both are R/o Bamlai Chowk, Mathpuraina, Raipur, Tahsil and District Raipur (C.G.).

----Applicants**Versus**

Rakesh Sahu, aged about 31 years S/o Shri Lekhram Sahu R/o Village Haldi, near Belaudi Bazar, Police Station Ranchirai, Tahsil Gunderdehi, District Balod (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicants	:	Mr. A.D. Kuldeep, Advocate
For Respondent	:	None.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel**Order on Board****30/04/2019**

1. Heard on admission.
2. Vide order dated 30/01/2019, the Family Court has granted monthly interim maintenance of Rs. 1500/- in favour of Applicant No. 1 and Rs. 1000/- in favour of Applicant No. 2. This revision has been preferred by the Applicants for further enhancement of the said interim maintenance amount on the ground that looking to the financial status of the Respondent, the interim maintenance granted by the Family Court is on lower side.
3. Counsel for the Applicant submits that the Respondent owned agricultural

land and he is also doing business to sell the shoes. He has sufficient income, therefore, the interim maintenance granted by the Family Court should be suitably enhanced.

4. I have heard counsel for the Applicant and perused the impugned order.
5. Though it was pleaded by the Applicants that the Respondent owned 8.5 acres of agricultural land, no documentary evidence is submitted by them in their support. The Respondent only admitted that he owned 14 dismil of land only, It was further pleaded by the Applicants that the Respondent have one tractor which he runs on rent. He also owned two houses which have also given on rent, but there is no documentary evidence in this regard.
6. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, particularly, the evidence available on record, the interim maintenance granted by the Family Court, in my view is just and proper.
7. Consequently, the revision has no merit and the same is dismissed at the motion stage itself.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge