



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 841 OF 2024

Pramod s/o Anil Chakranarayan

Vs.

Sadhna w/o Pramod Chakranarayan and anr.

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders.

Ms. Ragini K. Swami, Advocate for petitioner.

Ms. Riya Mundhaha, Advocate h/f Mr. Sagar S. Katkar,
Advocate for respondent Nos.1 & 2.

CORAM : M.M. NERLIKAR, J.

DATE : 18.11.2025

Heard the learned counsel appearing for the
petitioner as well as learned counsel appearing for
respondent Nos.1 & 2.

2. The petition is directed against the order of
interim maintenance granted by the Family Court, Akola
vide its order dated 23.02.2024, wherein the application
of the applicant/wife was rejected so far as interim
maintenance is concerned, however, the said application
was allowed to the extent of daughter granting interim
maintenance of Rs.11,000/- from the date of the said
application.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the
petitioner submits that the petitioner has availed a huge

loan and parents of the petitioner are dependent on him. The Court arriving at a conclusion of granting maintenance to the daughter, has not considered the material on record. Accordingly, she submits that the Family Court has arrived at a wrong conclusion and accordingly, prayed to quash the said order.

4. On the other hand, the learned counsel appearing for the respondent submits that the petitioner is getting a handsome salary, as he is a Sales Tax Inspector, working in the Sales Tax Department. She further submits that he is earning more than Rs.80,000/- per month. Further, he has invested amount in the share market and mutual funds and is getting Rs. 10,00,000/- from the said investments. The Family Court has rejected the application of the wife, however, it was allowed only to the extent of daughter. It is the responsibility of the father to maintain his daughter and, therefore, submits that the Family Court has rightly granted interim maintenance amount to the daughter and requested to reject the petition.

5. Upon hearing both the learned counsel, it *prima facie* appears that the petitioner is a Sales Tax Officer, which is undisputed. The learned counsel for the petitioner has even admitted that the daughter is born out of their wedlock. The parties have also filed the affidavit of assets and liabilities. From the affidavit of assets and

liabilities of the husband at Exhibit 20, it appears that the husband is earning Rs.80,990/- per month.

6. It further appears that though there is responsibility on the petitioner of his parents, similarly, it is also the responsibility of the petitioner to maintain his daughter. It appears that the father of petitioner is getting a pension of Rs.1,200/- per month. No doubt, it is a very meagre amount however, still as a father, it is the obligation of the petitioner to maintain his daughter also.

7. Considering this fact, I am not inclined to interfere in the order dated 23.02.2024 passed by the Family Court, Akola, hence, the petition is accordingly, dismissed.

(M.M. Nerlikar, J.)