

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.599 of 2018

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

=====

Mantu Kumar Son of Sri Indradev Singh, resident of Village Barew, P.S. Akbarpur, District- Nawada.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. Sulochana Devi Wife of Sri Mantu Kumar and D/o Sri Dinesh Sharma,
2. Rakhi Kumari, daughter of Sri Mantu Kumari, Both the Resident of Village Papar Nausa, P.S. Noorsarai, District Nalanda.

... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajesh Ranjan Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Bhola Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

4 02-08-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the Opposite Parties.

The petitioner is aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the order dated 3rd January, 2018 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Nalanda at Biharsharif in Maintenance Case No. 117 M of 2012 by which the learned court below has awarded maintenance allowance of Rs.4,000/- per month to the wife of the petitioner (O.P. No. 1) and Rs.2,000/- per month to the minor daughter of the petitioner (O.P. No. 2).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted privilege of anticipatory bail subject to condition that the petitioner will pay Rs. 4,000/- per month to O.P. No. 1 and since then he is paying the same.



Learned counsel for O.P. No. 1 submits that the petitioner is a Constable in Central Reserve Police Force posted at Udhampur which fact has not been controverted by learned counsel for the petitioner.

Having regard to the admitted position that the petitioner is a member of the Central Reserve Police Force and has a salary of over Rs.60,000/- per month whereas the learned court below has awarded a meagre amount of Rs.4,000/- per month to the wife and Rs.2,000/- per month to the minor daughter, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the same.

This revision application has no merit. It is dismissed with a cost of Rs.20,000/- payable by the petitioner to O.P. No. 1 within one month from today.

This Court has been informed that this petitioner is not paying the maintenance amount in terms of the judgment of the learned court below, if it is so, let the employer of the petitioner deduct the sum of Rs.6,000/- per month from the salary of the petitioner and remit it to the account of the applicants who are O.P. Nos. 1 and 2.

Learned counsel for the O.P. Nos. 1 and 2 submits that they had filed an application for enhancement of the maintenance amount which has been dismissed in default but he



will take appropriate steps for restoration of the same as early as possible.

This application stands disposed of accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

SUSHMA2/-

U			
---	--	--	--

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

