

SL- **106** **18.09.2025**
(Da)

CRR/2042/2025
SK. AJMARUL
VS
RAHIMA BEGUM AND ORS.

Mr. Supriyo Das, Advocate
.. ...For the petitioner

1. Petitioner assails an order dated February 15, 2025 passed in Criminal Revision No. 44 of 2022.
2. By the impugned order, revisional Court considered the order dated March 13, 2024 passed in Misc. Case No. 134 of 2020 by the Judicial Magistrate, Second Court, Uluberia, by which the learned Magistrate fixed maintenance at the rate of Rs.8,000/- per month.
3. Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that, there are three daughters born out of the wedlock. Petitioner is a daily labourer. He submits that the petitioner questions the paternity of one of the daughters. The other two daughters attained adulthood.
4. It is trite law that a High Court in exercise of powers under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code can interfere with an order passed in revision provided it is established that there is gross miscarriage of justice. In the facts of the present case, I am not in a position to arrive at a finding that there is a gross miscarriage of justice. An application under Section 125 of the Criminal Procedure Code filed by the private opposite party was duly considered by the learned Judicial Magistrate. Learned Judicial Magistrate arrived at a finding that Rs.8,000/- per month should be paid. Such order was challenged by way of a revisional application being Criminal Revision No. 44 of 2022. The revisional Court did not find any material irregularity warranting interference.

5. Impugned orders of either of the Judicial Magistrate or of the Revisional Court is not established to be perverse.
6. In such circumstances, I find no material irregularity in the order impugned.
7. CRR/2042/2025 is **dismissed**.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)