CGHC010365372026 2026:CGHC:43380

VAISHALI LUCKY NAGARIA Digitally signed by VAISHALI LUCKY NAGARIA

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 1269 of 2026

1 - Gulab Singh Khunte S/o- Ramprasad Khunte, Aged About 34 Years Occupation- Assistant Teacher, R/o- Gram- Bhauwakapa, Post Bharari, Police Station- Kota, District- Bilaspur (C.G.)

... Applicant(s)

versus

1 - Priyanka Khunte W/o- Gulab Singh Khunte, Aged About 32 Years R/o- Gram Bhatagaon Awadhpuri, Police Station- Purani Basti, Tehsil And District- Raipur (C.G.)

2 - Adwik Khunte S/o Gulab Singh Khunte Age 1.5 Years (Minor Through Legal Guardian-Mother Priyanka Khunte) R/o Gram- Bhatagaon Awadhpuri, Police Station- Purani Basti, Tehsil And District- Raipur (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s)	**:**	Dr. Arpit Lall, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	**:**	

(Hon'ble Shri Justice Naresh Kumar Chandravanshi)

Order on Board

07/10/2026

1. Heard on I.A. No.01 of 2026, application for condonation of delay in filing revision.
2. On due consideration and for the reason mentioned in the application, which is well supported by an affidavit, I.A. No.1 of 2026

is allowed and the delay of 23 days' in filing the revision is hereby condoned.

3. Also heard on admission.

4. This revision has been preferred by the applicant under Section 19(4) of the Family Court Act, 1984 (for short 'the Act, 1984'), challenging the order dated 22.05.2026, passed by the learned First Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Raipur (C.G.) in MCC No.1248 of 2025 (Priyanak Khunte vs Gulab Singh Khunte and Ors), whereby the learned Family Court has partly allowed the application filed by the respondents and granted Rs.15,00/- per month as interim maintenance only in favour of Respondent No.2, who is son of the applicant and respondent No.1/wife.

5. Learned counsel for the applicant would submit that applicant is posted on the post of Government Teacher and earning Rs.40,000/- per month as a salary. Respondent No.1/wife is also a Government Employee on the post of Lab Technician/Assistant Teacher, Science and earning Rs.44,105/- per month as a salary, despite that she has stated in her affidavit, filed in compliance of the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **Rajnesh vs. Neha** reported in **(2021) 2 SCC 324** that she has no source of income and also stated various other wrong facts, therefore, impugned order may be set aside.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant and perused the records.

7. As contended by the learned counsel for the applicant and upon perusal of the contents of the impugned order dated 22.05.2026 passed by the learned Family Court, it appears that applicant and respondent No.1/wife both are Government Employees and earning monthly salary of Rs.40,000/- and Rs.41,105/- respectively. It also

appears from the impugned order that interim maintenance of Rs.15,00/- per month has been granted by the Family Court in favour of the respondent No.2/son, therefore, this Court does not find any good ground to interfere in the impugned order. Even if, some wrong fact has been mentioned by the respondent No.1/wife in her affidavit, it can be considered on merits, but it cannot be a ground to reject the impugned order as granted in favour of respondent No.2, who is son of the applicant and respondent No.1/wife. Hence, this Court is not inclined to admit instant revision, therefore, the same is liable to be and is hereby dismissed at motion hearing stage.

Sd/-

(Naresh Kumar Chadravanshi)
Judge

Vaishali