

**THE HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE G. RADHA RANI**

**CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.613 OF 2013**

**ORDER:**

This Criminal Revision Case is filed by the petitioners against the order dated 08.02.2013 passed in MC No.83 of 2011 on the file of Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar.

2. The case of the petitioners was that they filed MC No.83 of 2011 under Section 125 Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance of Rs.6,000/- per month to the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner, Rs.8,000/- per month each to petitioner Nos.2 and 3 towards their food, clothing and educational expenses besides Rs.10,000/- per month towards medical expenses.

3. The respondent also filed counter.

4. The petitioner No.1 examined herself as PW.1 and got marked Exs.P1 to P3. No witnesses were examined on behalf of the respondent.

5. The learned Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District, on considering the evidence on record, allowed the MC, granting maintenance of Rs.5,000/- each to the petitioner Nos.1 to 3 from the date of the order.

6. Aggrieved by the said order, the petitioners preferred this revision contending that the court below passed the order without any reasons, the court below ought to have seen that the respondent was working as Hawaldar and getting Rs.43,479/- per month. The petitioners had no source of income and dependent on the mercy of the parents of petitioner No.1. The amount of Rs.15,000/- was very meager. They should have been awarded a sum of Rs.22,000/- towards food, clothing and educational expenses besides Rs.10,000/- per month towards medical expenses and prayed to allow the revision.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners failed to appear before the court and argue the matter on several occasions i.e. on 23.11.2021, 29.08.2022 and also today when the matter is posted 'for dismissal' i.e. 19.09.2022.

8. Though notice was directed to be served on the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent and the counsel for the petitioners was permitted to take out personal service of notice on the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent, the petitioners had not evinced interest to serve the notice on the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent.

9. Perused the record. As the record would disclose that the learned Judge, Family Court, after considering the evidence on record,

gave a reasoned order and as the Family Court also considered the salary of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent as Rs.43,000/- and odd as per Ex.P.3 and that he was working as a Hawaldar, awarded Rs.15,000/- per month to the petitioners No.1 to 3 herein. Hence, it is considered not necessary to interfere with the said order of the court below. However, as the maintenance is directed to be paid from the date of the order, it is considered fit to modify the same and to direct the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent to pay the same from the date of the petition and the arrears are to be paid within three (3) months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

10. In the result, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed confirming the order dated 08.02.2013 passed in MC No.83 of 2011 on the file of Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar. However, the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is directed to pay the amount to the petitioners as awarded by the court below from the date of filing of the petition and the arrears are to be paid within three (3) months from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall stand closed.

---

**Dr. G. RADHA RANI, J**

**September 19, 2022**  
KTL