

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.443 of 2017

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

Subhash Mandal Son of Late Mahadeo Mandal, Resident of Village- Ramani
Gangapur, Police Station- Murliganj, District- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Veena Devi wife of Subhash Mandal, Daughter of Baij Nath Sahani.
2. Seema Kumari, Minor Daughter of Subhash Mandal represented through Mother Veena Devi natural guardian. Both are Resident of Village- Ramani Gangapur, Police Station- Murliganj, District- Madhepura, at present C/o Baij Nath Sahani, Resident of Village- Jhalari, Police Station- Gwalpara, District- Madhepura.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kamal Kishore Singh
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

- 3 27-02-2023 This criminal revision application has been filed against order dated 15.05.2015 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Madhepura, District – Madhepura (hereinafter referred to as “Principal Judge”) in Misc. (Maintenance) Case No. 8 of 2013 whereby the learned Principal Judge has allowed the petition filed by opposite parties under Section 125 Cr.P.C. and directed the petitioner to pay maintenance amount of Rs. 3,000/- (three thousand) per month to opposite parties, who are wife and minor daughter respectively of petitioner, from the date of order i.e. 15.05.2015



on 10th day of every English month.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner that without appreciating the financial condition of the petitioner, the amount of maintenance has been fixed by the learned Principal Judge. He submits that petitioner is landless person and earns his livelihood by doing the work of casual labour. He next submits that the learned Principal Judge has also failed to take into consideration that opposite party no. 1 is living in adultery and without any sufficient reason, she has refused to live with the petitioner, however; in support of this submission, learned counsel for the petitioner has not placed any documentary evidence or any chit of paper.

From bare perusal of the impugned order, it is apparent that the learned Principal Judge, after taking into consideration the entire materials available on record, has fixed the amount of maintenance. In this age of high inflation, the maintenance amount of Rs. 3,000/- (three thousand) per month, as fixed by the learned Principal Judge, cannot be said to be excessive.

In view of aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court does not find any illegality or perversity in the impugned order, which requires any interference and accordingly, this



criminal revision application stands dismissed.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

anay/-

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

