

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Criminal Revision No. 15 of 2016**

1. Smt. Chandani Bai Sonwani, aged about 22 years W/o Jagatram Sonwani, Caste- Satnami,
2. Sumit Kumar, aged about 3 years S/o Jagatram Sonwani,
3. Ku. Priyanshi, aged about 1 year D/o Jagatram Sonwani,

No. 2 & 3 are minor, represented through legal guardian mother Smt. Chandani Bai,

All are R/o Village Ponch, Tahsil Baloda, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

----Applicant

Versus

Jagatram Sonwani, aged about 29 years S/o Govind Ram Sonwani, R/o Village Baloda, Tahsil Baloda, District Janjgir-Champa (C.G.)

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Jaiswal, Advocate
For Respondent	:	None

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel

Order on Board

14/03/2019

1. Heard finally.
2. Vide order dated 29/06/2015 passed in MJC No. 131/2013, the Family Court Janjgir has granted monthly maintenance of Rs. 1500, Rs. 1000/- and Rs. 500/- in favour of Applicant Nos. 1, 2 & 3, respectively. Thus, this revision has been filed by the Applicants for further enhancement.
3. I have heard counsel for the Applicant and perused the record minutely.
4. From perusal of the statement of witnesses, it is clear that Jainarayan

Applicant Witness No. 3 who is father of Applicant No. 1 and Santosh, Applicant Witness No. 3 have categorically admitted the fact that the Respondent is doing nothing. Om Prakash, Non-Applicant Witness No. 3 has also stated likewise. The Respondent himself stated that he is doing nothing, but he only admitted the fact that he owned two acres of agricultural land at village- Pooch. He also deposed that he got Rs. 19 lakhs as compensation.

5. From the evidence available on records shows that the Respondent/Husband is doing nothing. He only owned some agricultural land, but what income is he getting from that land is not established. Thus, it is clear that there is nothing on record on the basis of which it is established that the Respondent has permanent source of income, therefore, the Family Court, only on the ground that the Respondent is capable to perform the work of labour, has granted monthly maintenance in favour of the Applicants, which in my considered view is just and proper.
6. Consequently, the revision has no merit and the same is dismissed at the motion stage itself.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge