

BDP-SPS

Bharat
D.
Pandit
Digitally signed
by Bharat D.
Pandit
Date: 2020.01.28
13:51:16 +0530

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL WP NO. 2303 OF 2019**

Mr. Renzy Joseph Mudaliar

.... Petitioner.

V/s

Mr. Joseph Rajaram Mudaliar and Ors.

.... Respondents.

Smt. Harshada Kamble i/b Mr. Sagar N. Kamble for the Petitioner.

Smt. Deepa Kamath with Mr. Siddharth Samantaray a/w M/s Nelly
Mehta i/b NMA Legal for Respondent Nos. 1 and 2.

CORAM: NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

DATE: JANUARY 22, 2020

P.C.:-

1] Vide impugned order dated 25/1/2019, Petitioner/son is directed by the Family Court, Mumbai to pay maintenance of Rs 5000/- each to father and mother respectively.

2] Submissions are, family consists of other two members viz sister and brother and both are not taking any responsibility of the Respondents/parents. It is also claimed that sisters of Joseph i.e. father of the Petitioner are being maintained by the Petitioner which is an admitted fact and in the backdrop of aforesaid events, payment of maintenance of Rs 5000/- to each of the Respondents is unreasonable.

The learned Counsel then would urge that in addition to aforesaid liability, Petitioner is also required to maintain his own son.

3] The learned Counsel for the Respondents supported the order impugned and submits awarding of maintenance of Rs 5000/- is quite reasonable. Dismissal of the Petition is therefore sought.

4] On record, it reflects that gross salary of the Petitioner is Rs 59,988/- i.e. around Rs. 60,000/-. Spouse of the Petitioner is also employed whose gross salary is about Rs 45,000/- and net pay is Rs 35,000/-. In reply to the Petition, Respondents/parents have come out with a case that their other two siblings namely Reema and Ricky are also contributing for maintaining them.

5] In the aforesaid backdrop, in my opinion, no case for interference is made out in the order of granting maintenance. Petition fails and same stands dismissed.

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)