

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.81 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-0 Thana- District- Katihar

=====

PANKAJ RANJAN @ PANKAJ KUMAR RANJAN Son of Sri Ram Narayan
Sah Resident of Village - Amari Kukraun, P.S.- Dhamdaha, Distt.- Purnea.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

ARPANA KUMARI @ REKHA KUMARI D/o Sri Tarni Prasad Sah Resident
of Village - New Market Katihar, P.s.- Katihar, Distt.- Katihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Amit Kumar Anand, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH CHANDEL
ORAL ORDER

4 10-07-2024 Heard on admission.

2. This revision application has been preferred by the petitioner/ husband of respondent being aggrieved with the order dated 17.08.2019 passed by learned Judge of Family Court, Katihar in Maintenance Case No. 66(A)/2015 under Section 125 Cr.P.C. whereby learned Family Court while allowing the application directed the petitioner to pay a monthly maintenance of Rs. 15,000/- to the respondent.

3. At the time of argument, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that he confined his argument only on the quantum part of the maintenance.

4. It is argued by learned counsel that the learned



Family Court without being any sufficient evidence arrived on the conclusion that the petitioner is having a grocery shop had passed such order. He further submits that considering the income of the petitioner, the maintenance amount ordered by the learned Family Court is on high side, which should be reduced.

5. Bare perusal of the impugned order clearly shows that the petitioner/husband before the Family Court pleaded that the grocery shop which he runs is owned by his sister, however, for the best reason known to the petitioner, he did not examine himself nor his sister (actual owner of the grocery shop) before the Family Court to establish this fact.

6. Therefore, the Family Court rightly arrived on the conclusion that the petitioner is the person who is running the said grocery shop and also rightly arrived on the conclusion that he has sufficient means to maintain the respondent i.e. his wife.

7. Considering the entire evidence available on record as discussed above, I found that the finding recorded by learned Family Court is based upon the material



available on record. Thus, I do not find any merit in the present revision application.

9. Accordingly, this revision application stands dismissed at this stage.

(Arvind Singh Chandel, J)

tusharika/-

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

