

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.997 of 2016

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-1111 Thana- District-

=====

Sattar Ansari son of Jaimul Ansari R/o Village Jadopur, P.S.- Harsidhui,
District- East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Nazma Khatoon W/o Sattar Ansari, D/o Nasruddin Ansari
3. Saddam Hussain son of Sattar Ansari Both resident of Village- Jadapur, P.S.-
Harsidhi, District- East Champaran, present residing at Village- Siswa Tola
Turkaulia, P.S.- Banjaria, District- East Champaran.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Karandeep Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Sri Nand Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

- 2 26-02-2020 This revision application has been preferred for setting aside of the judgment and order dated 12.07.2016 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, East Champaran at Motihari in M.D. 02 of 2006 arising out of Maintenance Case No. 31 of 1997 by which the petitioner has been directed to pay Rs. 2,000/- per month to the opposite party no. 2 by 15th day of every succeeding month with effect from the filing of the petition filed under Section 127 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Petitioner has also been directed to pay a lump sum amount of Rs. 5,000/- to the opposite party no. 2 towards cost of litigation. Further direction has been issued to the petitioner to pay maintenance allowance of Rs. 400/- per month to the



opposite parties till 10.10.2012 as per direction given in the order dated 16.11.1998.

This Court has perused the impugned order and is satisfied that the learned Principal Judge has upon consideration of the entire materials on the record having noticed that the husband-opposite party no. 2 has got an income of Rs. 15,000/- per month and has got some income from agricultural land also directed for the payment of maintenance amount of Rs. 2,000/- and the cost of litigation as stated above.

Even otherwise this Court is of the opinion that the amount of Rs. 2,000/- awarded to the opposite party no. 2 cannot be by any stretch of imagination taken as unreasonable amount from the petitioner's point of view, it may be otherwise from the wife's point of view in the present day's price index of the country.

This Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned order. This revision application is, thus, dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/ved

U		T	
---	--	---	--

