

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.145 of 2024

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

Md. Taufique Alam

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Sinha, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Dr. Ajeet Kumar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH CHANDEL
ORAL ORDER

2 15-07-2024

Heard on admission.

2. This revision petition has been preferred by the petitioner-husband of the O.P. No. 2 being aggrieved with the Order dated 10.11.2023 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Gaya in Maintenance Case No. 95 of 2016 whereby, the petitioner-husband has been directed to pay a monthly maintenance amount of Rs. 7,000/- to the O.P. No. 2 his wife and Rs. 3,000/- to her baby child, w.e.f. the date of filing of maintenance case before the Family Court.

3. Undisputedly, the Respondent No. 2 is the legally wedded wife of the petitioner and presently she is residing separately with her child. On the basis of the statement of Respondent No. 2- wife as well as other evidences placed on record, the learned Family Court arrived on the conclusion that Respondent No. 2- wife is residing separately with sufficient



cause and the above finding recorded the learned Family Court is fit based upon the evidence available on record, and is neither perverse nor contrary to the record.

4. With regard to the quantum of maintenance amount is concerned the Family Court has granted total monthly amount of maintenance of Rs. 10,000/- against the petitioner.

5. Para 20 of the impugned judgment shows that the petitioner himself has admitted before the Family Court, the fact that he owned a seed shop in the town of Ranchi, he also admitted the fact that in his house a State Bank is running on rent. He further admitted the fact that a mobile tower is also installed in the said house. Though, as per the contention of the counsel the said house belongs to the uncle of the petitioner wherein he is getting small share but, this fact has not been established before the Family Court by the petitioner.

6. On considering the entire material available on record and the finding recorded by the Family Court, it appears that the maintenance amount awarded by the Family Court is just and proper. I do not find any merit in the said revision petition. Hence, the petition stands dismissed.

(Arvind Singh Chandel , J)

siddharth/-

U			
---	--	--	--

