

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.1343 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-1111 Thana- District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

=====

Premlata Devi wife of Jainendra Kumar Anjan, resident of Village- Khanothi,
Police Station- Sonahan, District- Kaimur Bhabua.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Jainendra Kumar Anjan, Son of Late Lok Nath Sharma, resident of Village-
Khanothi, Police Station- Sonhan, District- Kaimur Bhabua.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Satyendra Pandey, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Sri Arun Kumar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

5 17-02-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

The petitioner is aggrieved and dissatisfied with the
judgment dated 25.05.2018 passed by the learned Sessions
Judge, Kaimur at Bhabua in Cr. Appeal No. 55 of 2017.

By the impugned judgment the learned Sessions
Judge being the appellate court has refused to interfere with the
order dated 16.08.2017 passed by the learned A.C.J.M. IV,
Kaimur at Bhabua in connection with Complaint (Domestic
Violence) Case No. 844 of 2016.

It appears that while considering the complaint
petition of this petitioner, the learned A.C.J.M. IV, Kaimur at
Bhabua had awarded Rs. 8000/- per month for her maintenance.



Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that after his retirement, the opposite party no. 2 is getting a sum of Rs. 24,000/- per month as pension, therefore, the maintenance amount of Rs. 8000/- should be enhanced.

It appears on perusal of the impugned judgment that before the learned appellate court the opposite party no. 2 admitted his pension amount being Rs. 24,000/- but then a submission was made that there was no other income to him and he had to maintain himself and to bear his other expenses which were necessarily required including for his health and then it was also submitted that this petitioner who was appellant before the learned Sessions Judge was admittedly living in his house. Finding that the appellant was residing in the house of her husband and then she was awarded Rs. 8000/- per month as maintenance, learned Sessions Judge opined that the amount is a reasonable amount awarded to her particularly when she had not adduced any material showing her any other need in respect of any other matters such as her medical requirement.

This Court having perused the materials available on the record is of the considered opinion that the learned Sessions Judge has taken a reasonable view and at this stage no other material has been brought to the notice of this Court to take a



different view from the view taken by the learned appellate court.

This Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned judgment. This application is dismissed accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

avin/-

U			
---	--	--	--

