

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.1253 of 2018

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

=====

Abjit Kumar @ Tanu Son of Jay Ram Prasad, Resident of Village-Nehusa,
Police Station-Harnaut, District-Nalanda.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

Pushpanjali Sinha Wife of Abjit Kumar @ Tanu D/o Shiv Kumar Prasad
Sinha, at Present residing at Village-Noawan, Police Station-Asthama,
District-Nalanda.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Singh, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Seema Kumari, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIBEK CHAUDHURI
ORAL ORDER

3 13-12-2023 Heard learned Advocate for the petitioner as well
as learned APP for the State.

2. An ex parte order date 6th August, 2018 being
passed in Maintenance Case No. 99M of 2014, by the learned
Principal Judge, Family Court, Nalanda at Biharsharif, directing
the petitioner/husband to pay maintenance allowance at the rate
of Rs. 4,000/- per month to the opposite party no. 2/wife and Rs.
2,000/- per month to the daughter of the parties, total being Rs.
6,000/- per month, is assailed in the instant criminal revision.

3. On perusal of the revision application, this Court
does not find any ground made by the present petitioner to the
effect that he did not receive the notice of proceeding under
Section 125 of the Cr.P.C. or that he was prevented by sufficient



cause on the date of hearing to attend the trial court, for which an ex-parte order may be set aside.

4. On the other hand, the petitioner has made out a case assailing the opposite party's case on the point of his salary and other matters. It appears from the record that the petitioner did not receive the summons/notice of the proceeding, but failed to contest the application for maintenance.

5. On careful perusal of the entire evidence on record, the learned trial Judge directed the petitioner to pay maintenance at the rate of Rs. 4,000/- per month in favour of the wife and Rs. 2,000/- per month in favour her child.

6. Considering the impugned order dated 06.08.2018, I do not find any reason to interfere with the same and accordingly the impugned order is affirmed.

7. The instant revision application is thus dismissed on contest.

(Bibek Chaudhuri, J)

pravinkumar/-

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

