

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE P.SREE SUDHA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.366 of 2010

ORDER:

This Criminal Revision Case is filed against the Order dated 19.01.2010 in M.C.No.56 of 2009 passed by the learned Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge for the Trial of JHCBBC cum Additional Family Court cum XXIII Addl. Chief Judge, Hyderabad.

2. Heard the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor and perused the record.

3. The learned Counsel for the revision petitioner reported no instructions. Notice was issued to the petitioner on 04.11.2022, but she did not turn up.

4. Perusal of the record shows that One K.Bharathi/wife filed a petition in M.C.No.56 of 2009 against the respondent/husband claiming Rs.10,000/- per month towards her maintenance and stated that

they have two daughters and one son. The respondent/husband was retired as Sub-Registrar and getting a pension of Rs.15,000/- per month. In a Counter filed by the respondent/husband, it was observed that he was receiving a pension of Rs.6,200/- per month and he is also living in a house which was inherited from his mother. It seems that there are property disputes between the petitioner and the respondent. It was also stated that petitioner/wife was doing tailoring and earning well and also having bank accounts. The respondent/husband is a diabetic and aged about 65 years. Further he stated that the house in which the petitioner/wife is living is fetching her nearly Rs.15,000/- per month.

5. Petitioner/wife examined herself as PW-1 and the respondent/husband was examined as RW-1 and marked Exs.R1 and R2 which are bank pass books of the petitioner and also filed written arguments. Ex.R2 does not stand in the name of the petitioner. The

respondent/husband stated that he was getting only Rs.6,200/- per month and residing in own house. The trial Court after considering entire evidence on record granted Rs.1,000/- per month towards the maintenance of petitioner/wife with a direction to the respondent/husband to pay the same from the date of the order and before 5th of every month. Aggrieved by the said order of the petitioner/wife preferred the present Criminal Revision Case

6. The revision petitioner/wife mainly contended that the Order of the trial Court is not proper and respondent/husband is also having another property at Gachibowli area and moreover he also leased out two shops and a residential portion and also getting rents from the same in addition to his pension. She further stated that he had not proved that he is getting only Rs.6,200/- per month as pension and requested the Court to set aside the Order of the trial Court. She

stated that about the said other properties of the respondent, she filed another documents. The trial Court observed that respondent is getting pension of Rs.6,200/- per month and the petitioner is also residing in the house which fetches Rs.15,000/- per month and granted an amount of Rs.1,000/- per month towards her maintenance and there is no infirmity in the said Order of the trial Court.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, the trial Court has rightly considered the evidence on record and granted maintenance amount. Therefore, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the Order of the trial Court. Hence, the present Criminal Revision Case is devoid of merits.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed.

Miscellaneous petitions pending, if any, shall stand closed.

JUSTICE P.SREE SUDHA

DATED: 01.02.2023

plp

THE HONOURABLE SMT. JUSTICE P.SREE SUDHA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No. 366 of 2010

DATED: 01.02.2023

plp