

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.893 of 2016

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

Neeraj Kumar Shrivastava son of Dinesh Prasad Sinha Resident of Village-
Atimi, Police Station Navanagar, District Buxar Presently Posted at State
Bank of Patiyala, Regional Office, Jalandhar Punjab

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. State Of Bihar and Anr
2. Vandana Shrivastava wife of Neeraj Kumar Shrivastava, daughter of
Kamleshwar Prasad Shrivastava at Present residing at Mohalla New Shital
Tola, Ara, Police Station Nawada, District Bhojpur at Ara

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dineshwar Pandey, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Smt. Pushpa Sinha, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

5 26-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

Petitioner in this case is aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the order dated 20.07.2016 passed in Maintenance Case No. 168 of 2012 by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Bhojpur at Ara by which the learned Principal Judge, Family Court has awarded Rs. 11,000/- per month as maintenance to the opposite party no. 2 (wife) and Rs. 7,000/- per month to her daughter from the date of the order.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has though assailed the impugned order on the quantum of the maintenance by submitting that the petitioner has other expenses and is required to maintain his father as well, learned counsel admits that in



course of evidence before the learned Principal Judge, Family Court it has categorically come that the father of the petitioner is a practicing lawyer at civil court, Buxar and as such the learned Principal Judge refused to accept the submission of the petitioner that this father is dependent upon him. On the quantum of maintenance, learned counsel admits that in January, 2016 the petitioner was employed as a Bank Officer and he has continued to be an officer of the bank, at the relevant time he was drawing a gross salary of Rs. 60,000/- per month which must have increased by now.

On the face of the amount of salary which the petitioner was drawing, in the opinion of this Court, award of a total sum of Rs. 18,000/- towards maintenance of his wife and daughter who is growing and has got school expenses etc. cannot be said to be an unreasonable or excessive amount awarded by learned Principal Judge.

This Court finds no reason to interfere with the quantum of maintenance. This revision application is, thus, dismissed.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

arvind/ved-

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

