

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.635 of 2022

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

Dhirendra Kumar @ Dhirendra Kunwar Son of Mahesh Kunwar, R/o Village
- Bajpatti Bangaon, P.S.- Bajpatti, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Anju Devi D/o Mahendra Singh, R/o Village - Madhiya, P.S.- Basopatti,
District- Madhubani.

... .. Respondents

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Ashok Kumar Jha, Advocate
For the OP. No. 2	:	Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, Advocate
		Mr. Vinod Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Upendra Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

5 04-08-2025 The present revision petition has been preferred against the impugned order dated 26.07.2022 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Madhubani in M.R. Case No. 273 of 2012 filed under Section 125 of the CPC, whereby learned Principal Judge, Family Court has directed the petitioner-husband to pay Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) per month to the wife / opposite party no. 2 herein towards her maintenance from the date of the order, i.e., 26.07.2022.

2. I heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 and learned APP for the State.

3. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for



the petitioner confined his submission only to the quantum of maintenance. He submits that in view of the source of income of the petitioner, the quantum of maintenance is on the higher side.

4. Whereas, learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2 submits that there is no illegality or infirmity in the quantum of maintenance as awarded by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Madhubani in favour of the opposite party no. 2. He further submits that petitioner-husband is a businessman and he is running a general store and also having 20 *bighas* of land and he is also a contractor and owns a bus.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that he is merely a farmer and he has only few *bighas* of land jointly with his father and he is only son of his father and he has no any other business.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the quantum of maintenance appears to be on the higher side and in my considered view, payment of Rs. 6000/- (Rupees six thousand only) per month to the opposite party no. 2 namely, Anju Devi towards her maintenance would meet the ends of justice.

7. Hence, the impugned order is be modified, accordingly. The rest part of the judgment will remain intact.



8. Accordingly, the present Criminal Revision petition stands disposed of.

9. LCR be sent back to the concerned Court forthwith for enforcement of the order as per law.

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

Shahnawaz/Chandan-

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

