

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.271 OF 2024

Sushil Dhondu Gaikwad	...Applicant
<i>Versus</i>	
Madhuri Sushil Gaikwad & Anr.	...Respondents

Mr. Chetan Arvind Alai a/w. Ms. Rama Somani, Mr. Bhushan Bhadgale and Mr. Chinmay Sawant, Advocates, for the Applicant.
Ms. Shilpa G. Talhar, APP, for the Respondent No.2-State.

CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.
DATED : 22nd JANUARY 2025

PC:-

1. Heard Mr. Anay Alai, learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant and Ms. Shilpa Talhar, learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent-State.

2. By the present Criminal Revision Application, challenge is to the orders dated 16th February 2021 passed in Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 1153 of 2015 as well as to the order dated 11th March 2016 passed below Exhibit-5 in O.M.A. No.1153 of 2015 by the learned J.M.F.C., Pimpri, Pune and to the order

dated 19th January 2024 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Pune in Criminal Appeal No.50 of 2021.

3. By the impugned order dated 16th February 2021, the present Applicant has been directed to pay Rs.15,000/- per month to the Respondent i.e. wife for her maintenance and maintenance to her son and daughter.

4. The position on record shows that the Applicant is working in Tata Motors and earning salary of Rs.80,000/- per month. Apart from that, he is also running “Biryan House” and earning income of Rs.30,000/- per month. Maintenance of only Rs.15,000/- is granted to the Respondent-Wife and two children.

5. It is the contention of Mr. Chetan Alai, learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant that the elder son of the Applicant is aged 27 years and daughter is aged 20 years. Till the marriage of the daughter, it is the responsibility of the father i.e. Applicant to maintain the daughter.

6. In any case, considering the overall facts and circumstances, only Rs.15,000/- has been granted as maintenance to the wife as well as to the children and even if, the said maintenance is considered as maintenance for wife and daughter, then also the same is inadequate.

7. Accordingly, no case is made out for interference in the impugned orders.

8. The Criminal Revision Application is disposed of in above terms with no order as to costs.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]