



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

908 CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 135 OF 2019

**VINAYAK SANDU SONAWANE
VERSUS
KADUBAI VINAYAK SONAWANE**

.....
Advocate for Applicant : Mr. Paithankar Prakash B. (ABSENT)
.....

**CORAM : Y.G. KHOBRAGADE, J.
DATE : 12.06.2025**

PC.:-

1. Though the matter is repeatedly called out and even after recess, the counsel for the revision applicant remained absent.
2. The present revision under Section 397 of the Cr.P.C. is directed against the order dated 15.01.2019 passed by the learned Family Court, Ahmednagar, in Petition No.E-87/2018, whereby the amount of maintenance has been enhanced to Rs.1800/- from Rs.600/- which was granted on 08.07.2011.
3. On perusal of the impugned order it appears that, the revision applicant has not disputed about filing of earlier application for maintenance. On 08.07.2011, the learned trial Court passed an order under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C. and granted maintenance in favour of the present

respondent/original applicant @ Rs.600/- per month, however, due to change in circumstances as well as due to increase in prices of essential commodities, the non-applicant/original applicant filed an application under Section 127 of the Cr.P.C. and prayed for enhancement of maintenance allowance.

4. On 15.01.2019, the learned Family Court passed the impugned order considering the lapse of period and hike of prices of essential commodities and has considered the law laid down in the case of **Vidyadhar Vs. Mankikrao & Anr.; AIR 1999 SC 1441** and **U. Sree Vs. U. Srinivas** decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 11.12.2022 in Civil Appeal Nos..8927-8928/2012, **Kalyan Dey Chowdhury V/s. Rita Dey Chowdhury Nee Nandy; (2017) 14 SCC 200** and **Dineshkumar Ladulal Aarya Vs. State of Gujarat in Criminal Revision Application No.953/2018**.

5. The revision applicant has not brought any substantial material on record to show that, the findings recorded by the learned trial Court are perverse, illegal, bad in law. Therefore, I do not find any substantial reasons to interfere with the impugned Judgment by invoking jurisdiction under Section 397 of the Cr.P.C. Hence, the revision is dismissed.

[Y.G. KHOBRADE, J.]