

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.101 OF 2020

**RAHUL S/O. ANNASAHEB FALKE
VERSUS
PRIYADARSHANI W/O. RAHUL FALKE**

...
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Tribhuwan Nitin T
Advocate for Respondent : Mr. P.V. Barde

...
CORAM : S.G. MEHARE, J.

DATED : JANUARY 13, 2023

PER COURT:-

1. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned counsel for the respondent.
2. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that after marriage, the present applicant lost the job; hence, the quantum determined by the Court is exorbitant.
3. Per contra, learned counsel for the respondent-wife would argue that the learned Court of first instance has correctly assigned the reasons and considered the situation on the day of cause of action. The reasons assigned for determining the quantum were in tune with the settled law. Still, the applicant has a handsome income and he can pay the maintenance granted by the learned Court of first instance.
4. Perused the impugned order. The income proof was placed before the learned Court of first instance; however, taking into

consideration the stand of the present applicant, the learned Court of first instance observed that the conduct of the present applicant and falsity on his part speaks in volume. The petitioner/present respondent has also filed copies of the 7/12 extract showing that there was a landed property in the name of the respondent/present applicant, his father and other members of the family. The learned Court of first instance observed that when he was working in a company at Pune, he was earning around Rs.25,000/- per month. Taking into consideration his ability to earn and landed property, the learned Court of first instance hold that he was able to provide separate maintenance to the petitioner/present respondent. The Court directed him to pay Rs.10,000/- per month towards maintenance to the petitioner/present respondent.

5. After having gone through the reasons and the documents discussed by the learned Court of first instance, the Court is of the view that there are no substantial ground to interfere the impugned order. Hence, the revision application stands dismissed.

6. Record and proceedings be returned to the learned Court of first instance.

(S.G. MEHARE, J.)