

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 2215 OF 2017

Sreejith Krishnamurthy

...Petitioner

Versus

Mrs.Vidhya Sreejith & Ors.

...Respondents

Mrs.Pooja Sejpal I/b. Mr.Nitin Sejpal for the Petitioner.
Mr.Onam Hingorani I/b. Mr.V.K.Hingorani for Respondent Nos.1 and 2.
Mr.A.R.Patil, APP for Respondent No.3-State.

CORAM : S.S.SHINDE J.

DATE : 06 JUNE, 2019

P.C.:

1. Heard learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned Counsel appearing for the respondents.
2. It is submitted by learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner that salary of the petitioner is Rs.85,000/- p.m. The petitioner has to look after his father. It is further submitted that the petitioner has to pay monthly installment of Rs. 8,237/- towards housing loan and, therefore, the amount ordered by the trial Court may be reduced to Rs.15,000/- p.m. from Rs. 30,000/- p.m.

3. On the other hand, learned Counsel appearing for respondent Nos.1 and 2 invites attention of this Court to the findings recorded by the trial Court and submits that, after considering the income of the petitioner and also liabilities, the trial Court has directed the petitioner to pay Rs.30,000/- p.m. towards maintenance to respondent Nos. 1 and 2, pending the main proceedings. It is submitted that during pendency of the main proceedings before the trial Court, the petitioner has sold the house.

4. Upon appreciating the rival contentions and upon perusal of the findings recorded by the trial Court and also keeping in view the income of the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that no case is made out to cause interference in the concurrent findings recorded by the Courts below. Hence, the Petition is devoid of any merits and accordingly stands rejected.

(S.S.SHINDE, J.)