

17.04.2026
Court No.13
Item Nos.1-2
pk

FA 30 of 2010
CAN 3 of 2026

Subir Kumar Ghosh
Vs.
Gayatri Ghosh
With
RVW 78 of 2026
CAN 1 of 2026
Gayatri Ghosh
Vs.
Subir Kumar Ghosh

Mr. Saumyajit Ghosal,
Mrs. Manideepa Paul (Roy),
Mrs. Soma Dey

.... for the appellant.

Mr. Sayantan Adhya

... for the respondent

Re :CAN 3 of 2026

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court is taken on record.
2. CAN 3 of 2026 is an application filed by the husband praying for modification of the order dated 18.02.2026 as corrected by order dated 27.02.2026.
3. Particular reference of this Court is gone to last line of paragraph 12 where payment of permanent alimony shall be made by bank transfer.
4. It is submitted despite repeated requests the respondent has not furnished the bank particulars of the opposite party/wife.

5. It is clear from the order-in-question that payment is required to be made upon bank particulars being furnished.

6. In that view of the matter CAN 3 of 2026 is disposed of.

Re :CAN 1 of 2026

7. CAN 1 of 2026 has been filed in aid of RVW 78 of 2026. Review is sought of this Court's order dated 18.02.2026 as corrected subsequently on the ground that alimony of Rs.6,00,000/- is grossly insufficient to meet the future requirements of the opposite party/wife.

8. It is submitted that the son is 33 years old. He is masters in commerce and does accounting work for a chartered accountant.

9. Apart from the fact that this Court has found on the earlier occasion and had observed orally that the opposite party/wife could have easily secured a job after separation from her husband or at least tried to take up some vocation of business. It appears that the opposite party wife has chosen to rely entirely on the alimony being provided by the husband.

10. Be that as it may, there are absolutely no new evidence brought on record in CAN 1 of 2026 nor have any changed circumstances been indicated to Court in the said CAN 1 of 2026.

11. There is no error apparent on the face of record.

12. In the back drop of the above, this Court is of the view that there are no grounds acceptable under Order 47 to review the order dated 18.02.2026 as corrected later.

13. RVW 78 of 2026 is dismissed. Consequently, CAN 1 of 2026 is also dismissed.

14. There will be no order as to costs.

15. All parties are directed to act on a server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Rajasekhar Mantha, J.)

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J.)