



\$~26

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 80/2025**
PRIYANKA GAUTAM

.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Kali Charan, Advocate.

versus

JATIN

.....Respondent
Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

% **17.02.2025**

CRL.M.A. 5023/2025 (Seeking Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. The Application stands disposed of accordingly.

CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 80/2025

3. A Criminal Revision Petition under Section 438/442 read with Section 528 BNSS, 2023 has been filed to challenge the impugned Order dated 04.12.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court directing ad-interim maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month to be continued to be paid by the Respondent wife by the Petitioner husband.

4. It is submitted in the Petition that the parties got married on 09.12.2020 according to Hindu customs and rites and about Rs.1 Crore was spent on their marriage. They lived together in the house of the Respondent, however, no child till date is born from their wed lock. It is claimed that the



demand of Rs.20 lakh cash was made from the father of the Petitioner. The Petitioner requested them that they are not in a position to meet such demands.

5. She has further alleged that after a few days father-in-law of the Petitioner came to her room in the middle of the night and started misbehaving with her. She informed the mother-in-law about the incident, but the Petitioner was threatened with dire consequences, if she told the incident to anybody. The Petitioner is subjected to various atrocities. She was not allowed inside the matrimonial home on 17.03.2024.

6. An FIR No.110 dated 20.03.2024 under Section 27 Arms Act and Section 147/149/323/328/354-A/376/377/406/498-A/506/511 IPC was registered at Police Station Ballabgharh, Sadar.

7. The present Revision Petition has been filed against the impugned Order dated 04.12.2024 on the ground that Respondent has admitted in his Reply that he is earning Rs.35,000/- per month and is employed in Delhi Jal Board as a Civil Engineer and is a qualified B.Tech in Civil Engineering. He also owns a Water Tanker which is working in Delhi Jal Board and his earning are Rs.3 lakhs per month. The learned Family Judge in the impugned Order dated 07.12.2024 has not considered the correct income of the Respondent and therefore, appropriate interim maintenance be granted to the Petitioner.

8. **Submissions heard and record perused.**

9. From the Order it seems that while the Reply/Written Statement along with the Affidavit, has been filed on behalf of the Respondent; on the request of the Petitioner for ad-interim maintenance, a sum of Rs.10,000/- per month has been directed to be paid by the Respondent to the Petitioner.



It is essentially an ad-interim maintenance Order. There is nothing reflected in the Revision Petition for revising the interim maintenance which is only ad-interim and the Interim Maintenance shall be decided in accordance with the Affidavits of Income filed and contentions of the parties.

10. There is no ground for interfering with the impugned Order dated 04.12.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court.

11. The Revision Petition stands disposed of accordingly.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2025/va