

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.956 of 2018

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

Shashi Yadav, S/o Radha Nandan Yadav, Resident of Village- Phulkaha, P.S.
Gamharia, District- Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. State of Bihar
2. Pinki Devi, W/o Shashi Yadav, resident of Village Sahugarh, Deebani Tola,
P.S. and District- Madhepura.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Kumar Vishoka Nand, Advocate
for the Informant	:	Mr. Rupesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr. Pramod Kumar Pandey, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

12 28-02-2023 This criminal revision application has been filed against order dated 24.08.2017 passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, Madhepura in Miscellaneous (Maintenance) Case No. 145 of 2013 under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C. whereby, the learned Principal Judge has directed the petitioner to pay Rs. 5,000/- (five thousand) per month to the opposite party No. 2 (wife of the petitioner), as maintenance allowance.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that pursuant to impugned order dated 18.01.2023, the petitioner has already deposited Rs. 2,50,000/- (two lakh fifty thousand) in the account of opposite party No. 2 as an arrear, copy of which is annexed vide 2nd supplementary affidavit to this application.



He next submits that the learned Court below has fixed the amount of maintenance without appreciating the financial condition of the petitioner. It is further submitted that this petitioner has four daughters with opposite party No.2 and two of the four daughters namely, Pallavi Kumari and Pammi Kumari, aged about 16 years and 13 years respectively, are residing with and are being maintained by the petitioner.

I have carefully perused the impugned order. The monthly maintenance allowance of Rs. 5,000/- (five thousand) per month to opposite party No. 2 (wife of the petitioner) in this age of high inflation cannot be said to be excessive or onerous.

In such circumstances, I am not inclined to interfere with the impugned order in the background of facts which have been mentioned in the impugned order.

I do not find any merit in this application. This criminal revision application is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Navya/-

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

