

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.462 of 2022

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

=====

Dharmendra Kumar Gupta Son Of Haridwar Prasad R/O Mohalla- Jail Road,
Ara, Infront Of Har Prasad Das Jain Digamber Dharmshala, Ara, P.S.- Ara
Nagar, District- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

Nisha Kumari @ Babli Kumari @BABLI Devi @ Babli W/O Dharmendra
Kumar Gupta, D/O Sankar Sah R/O Mohalla- Jail Road, Ara, Infront Of Har
Prasad Das Jain Digamber Dharmshala, Ara, P.S.- Ara Nagar, District-
Bhojpur. At Present Mohalla- Maurya Vihar Anandpuri, Kagaul, B.M.P. 16,
P.S.- Khagaul, District- Patna

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anjani Parashar, Adv.
For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR JHA
ORAL ORDER

3 07-10-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

02. The petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated
07.05.2022 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court,
Bhojpur at Ara in Maintenance Case No. 77 of 2017 whereby
and whereunder the learned Family Court allowed the petition
of the opposite party and directed the petitioner to make
payment of Rs.5000/- as maintenance amount to the opposite
party and Rs.2,500/- each to her two daughters towards their
maintenance and educational expenses per month. The learned
Family Court further ordered the petitioner to make payment of
Rs.10,000/- as one time litigation cost to the opposite party.



03. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned order is bad in law and is fit to be set aside. The petitioner had been earning Rs.5000/- per month during the pendency of the maintenance case and he even lost his job during Covid. The opposite party herself does not want to stay with the petitioner in her matrimonial home and the petitioner has filed Matrimonial Case No. 244 of 2016 for restitution of conjugal rights and the said case is still pending. But this fact was not considered by the learned trial court. The learned trial court has also not considered that the opposite party is a self employed person and has been earning Rs.10,000/- per month.

04. Perused the record.

05. From perusal of the record it transpires that though the petitioner appeared before the learned trial court he neither cross-examined the witnesses of the opposite party nor adduced his own evidence. The learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Bhojpur proceeded in the matter considering the evidence adduced on behalf of the opposite party holding that there was no reason to disbelieve the evidence of the opposite party. I find no reason to interfere with such order as the petitioner has miserably failed to show a single illegality, infirmity or impropriety in the impugned order. Hence, the



impugned order dated 07.05.2022 is affirmed.

06. Accordingly, the present petition stands dismissed.

(Arun Kumar Jha, J)

anuradha/-

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

