

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Criminal Revision No. 116 of 2014**

1. Smt. Lalita Sahu W/o Shri Pawan Sahu, aged about 24 years,
2. Ku. Pratima Sahu D/o. Shri Pawan Sahu, aged about 05 years,
3. Ku. Vidya D/o. Shri Pawan Sahu, aged about 3 years wrongly mentioned as 9 years)

Applicant No. 2 & 3 are Minor through their natural guardian Mother Smt. Laltia Sahu.

All are R/o Village Semo at present Village Baijalpur, Thana Pipariya, Civil & Revenue Distt. Kabeerdham (C.G.)

----Applicants

Versus

Pawan Sahu S/o Shri Deepchand Sahu, aged about 27 years R/o Village Semo, thana Pipariya, Civil & Revenue Distt. Kabeerdham (C.G.).

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Sumit Shrivastava, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Mr. Ajit Singh, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order on Board

06/02/2019

1. While allowing the application under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C. filed by the Applicants, the Family Court vide impugned order dated 04/01/2014 passed in MJC No. 223/2013 granted monthly maintenance of Rs. 700/- in favour of Applicant No.1 and Rs. 500/- each in favour of Applicants 2 & 3. Thus, this revision has been filed by the Applicants on the ground that looking to the financial status and earning capacity of the Respondent, the maintenance amount awarded by the Family Court is on lower side.
2. I have heard counsel for both the parties and perused the records as also the impugned order.
3. In para 9 of his cross examination, the Respondent himself admitted the

fact that at Village Semo, there is 1.79 acres of agricultural land on his name. He also admitted the fact that at village Manpur, there is 0.79 acres of agricultural land on joint names of him and his younger brother. He further admitted that there is also an agricultural land ad-measuring 1.98 acres on his name at village Manpur. He further admitted that there is also an agricultural land at village Manpur ad-measuring 6.31 acres on joint names of him, his brother Uttam and his brother Nand Kumar. He further admitted the fact that nobody is dependent on him. In para 10, he also admitted the fact that he got a job card in the scheme of MANREGA. From the above, it is clear that the Respondent has sufficient means to maintain the Applicants.

4. Looking to the financial status and earning capacity of the Respondent, the maintenance amount granted by the Family Court is on lower side. Therefore, it is ordered that the Respondent shall now pay Rs. 1500/- to Applicant No. 1, Rs. 1000/- to Applicant No. 2 and Rs. 1000/- to Applicant No. 3 as monthly maintenance from today.
5. Accordingly, this revision is allowed to the extent indicated above.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge