

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.837 of 2016

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

Pradum Kumar Singh @ Parduman Singh Son of Rajendra Singh resident of
Village -Siyalpora, P.C.-Fatepur, P.S. Balrampur, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Santosh Kumari @ Santola Devi D/o Kalu singh
3. Kesh Kumar Minor son of Santola Kumari @ Santola Devi represented
through his natural Guardian Mother Santola Devi resident of Village-
Siyalpur , P.S.- Fatepur, P.S.- Balrampur, District- Katihar

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Smt Pushpa Sinha, APP
For Res. No. 2 & 3	:	Mr. Rajendra Prasad Sah, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

5 04-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the opposite parties.

The petitioner in this case is aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the judgment and order dated 20.05.2016 passed by learned Addl. Principal Judge, Family Court, Katihar in Maintenance Case No. 78 of 2010 whereby the petitioner has been directed to pay a sum of Rs. 2500/- per month to opposite party no. 3 through opposite party no. 2 w.e.f. 15.04.2010 i.e. the date of filing of the case.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the learned court below has awarded maintenance amount of Rs. 2,500/- without there being any material to support the case of



the applicant-wife. Learned counsel submits that until it is decided by a competent court of law that the child is that of this petitioner, the impugned judgment and order need not to be given effect to.

On the other hand, learned counsel for the opposite parties no. 2 and 3 submits that in course of evidence in the court below ample materials have come on the record to take a view that the boy has taken birth out of the physical relationship established between the parties and as such the quantum of amount being a paltry amount of Rs. 2,500/-, no interference is required.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and on perusal of the records, this Court is of the considered opinion that the impugned order needs no interference on the face of the materials available on the record. The amount awarded by the learned court below is Rs. 2,500/- per month which cannot be said to be exaggerated considering the present price index of the country.

This application has no merit. It is dismissed accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

avin/-

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

