



CrI.R.C.No.513 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 26.08.2025

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE **G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN**

CrI.R.C.No.513 of 2024
and CrI.M.P.No.4894 of 2024

Vadivel

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. Rajalakshmi
2. Minor Yashwanth
Rep. by her mother
Rajalakshmi

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Revision has been filed under Section 397 r/w 401 of Cr.P.C., praying to set aside the order dated 03.01.2024 passed in M.C.No.12 of 2023, on the file of the Family Court, Dharmapuri, as illegal, incompetent, without jurisdiction and liable to be set aside.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Muruganantham

For Respondents : No appearance

ORDER

The Criminal Revision Case has been preferred as against the order dated 03.01.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Dharmapuri, in M.C.No.12 of 2023, thereby ordered maintenance of Rs.5,000/- each per month and a sum of Rs.25,000/- per annum, in favour of the respondents.



CrI.R.C.No.513 of 2024

WEB COPY 2.

The petitioner got married with the first respondent on 10.07.2013 and gave birth to the second respondent. Due to misunderstanding between them, they got separated and living separately. Therefore, the respondents could not maintain themselves and filed petition for maintenance. After full fledged trial, the trial Court awarded maintenance of Rs.5,000/- each per month and a sum of Rs.25,000/- each per annum to the respondents from the date of the petition. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner filed the present petition.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a daily coolly and he is not earning any money as alleged by the respondents. That apart, the first respondent got married one Govindaraj and living in adultery life. Therefore, the first respondent is not entitled for any maintenance.

4. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and perused the materials placed before this Court. Though notice served and the name is also printed in the cause list, no one is appeared on behalf of the respondents either by person or through pleader.



CrI.R.C.No.513 of 2024

WEB COPY

5. Though the petitioner raised specific ground that the first respondent is living adultery life with one Govindaraj, the petitioner failed to prove the same with any evidence. Further, though the petitioner alleged that the first respondent is working in a private concerned and earning Rs.50,000/- per month, he failed to prove the same by any evidence. On the other hand, the respondents produced land document in favour of the petitioner. Even according to the petitioner, he is doing welding work and also having cattle farm. Therefore, the trial Court rightly awarded a sum of Rs.5,000/- each to the respondents and it is very meagre one. This Court finds no infirmity or illegality in the order passed by the Court below and the the present petition is devoid of merits.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case stands dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

26.08.2025

Index : Yes/No
Neutral Citation : Yes/No
Speaking/Non Speaking order
rts

Page 3 of 4



WEB COPY



CrI.R.C.No.513 of 2024

G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN. J,

rts

To

1. The Judge,
Family Court,
Dharmapuri,

CrI.R.C.No.513 of 2024
and CrI.M.P.No.4894 of 2024

26.08.2025