

Sl. 104
28.04.2025
Court No.6
BP

C.O. 947 of 2025

Saptarshi Ray
-versus-
Krishnokali Ray Khasnabish

Ms. Baishali Ghoshal
..for the petitioner

This application under Article 227 of the Constitution is at the instance of the husband and is directed against an order dated June 5, 2024 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, 10th Court at Alipore in Misc. Case No. 810 of 2017 arising out of Matrimonial Suit No. 2776 of 2017.

By the order impugned the application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act was allowed thereby directing the petitioner to pay alimony pendente lite to the wife.

The learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the child is staying with the petitioner and the petitioner is bearing all the expenses of the child. She further submits that the opposite party herein is earning a substantial sum of money through private tuition.

The learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that the wife/opposite party herein has suppressed her income by not disclosing the relevant facts in the affidavit of assets.

After going through the impugned order this Court finds that the learned trial judge took note of the fact that

the petitioner is an Assistant Professor of a reputed college at Kolkata and monthly income is about Rs. 1,33,396/-.

The learned trial judge also took note of the fact that the child is residing with the petitioner and she is studying in a reputed school at Kolkata and the father is bearing all the expenses for the daughter. The learned trial judge observed that the opposite party herein would be entitled to higher amount of alimony pendente lite provided she had not suppressed her income. Thus this Court finds that the allegation of suppression of the income by the wife was taken note of by the learned trial judge while fixing the quantum of alimony pendente lite.

After going through the materials on record this Court is of the considered view that the amount of alimony fixed by the learned trial judge appears to be a reasonable amount.

For such reason, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the order impugned.

With the above observations and directions, C.O. 947 of 2025 stands disposed of.

No order as to costs.

Urgent certified photocopy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties expeditiously on compliance of usual legal formalities.

(Hiranmay Bhattacharyya, J.)