



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 07 OF 2025
WITH
CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO.1505 OF 2025
IN REVN/07/2025

Shashikant @ Pramod S/o. Narayan Kamble,
Age : 38 years, Occu. : Service,
R/o. Lohar Galli, Kasba, Tq. Indapur,
Dist. Pune,
At present Bank of Badoda,
Nagdevi Street Branch, Mumbai - 3.

... Applicant

Versus

1. Sneha W/o. Shashikant @ Pramod Kamble,
Age : 32 years, Occu. : Household,
2. Angha D/o. Shashikant @ Pramod Kamble,
Age : 8 years, Respondent No.2 is minor
under Guardianship of her real mother,
Both R/o. Lohar Galli, Kasba, Tq. Indapur,
Dist. Pune.
At present Deshpande Colony, Latur.

... Respondents

.....
Ms. Manjusha S. Jagtap, Advocate for Applicant/Petitioner.
Mr. Dattatraya V. Tele, Advocate for Respondents.

.....

CORAM : ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.
RESERVED ON : 04 MARCH 2026
PRONOUNCED ON : 05 MARCH 2026

ORDER :

1. In this revision, there is challenge to the judgment and order dated 20.08.2024 passed by learned Family Court, Latur in Petition No. E-34 of 2020 granting maintenance to the respondents on application Exhibit 149.

2. Learned counsel for revision petitioner pointed out that, revision petitioner is husband of respondent no.1. That, wife and daughter instituted above referred proceedings before the learned Family Court, Latur by invoking section 125 Cr.P.C. and seeking maintenance. According to him, maintenance is liable to be paid only when wife has no means of source; however, according to him, father of wife has huge irrigated agricultural land and has several house properties fetching rental income. That, moreover, revision petitioner has the responsibility of his family members to be shouldered. Furthermore, according to learned counsel, wife left the house and the company of husband without just and sufficient cause; and therefore, she is not entitled to receive maintenance. However, according to learned counsel, learned Family Court has not considered and appreciated this and granted maintenance of Rs.20,000/- per month to wife and Rs.15,000/- to daughter. Hence, she questions the impugned judgment and order and prays to set aside the same.

3. Per contra, learned counsel for respondent would justify the order of learned Family Court by pointing out that, husband by working as a Manager in the bank earns over Rs.1.35 lakh per month. That, husband has neglected and failed to maintain his wife and daughter, who were constrained to live separately. Learned

counsel pointed out that, learned Family Court had correctly appreciated the entire case put-forth by each of the side and has committed no error whatsoever and finally prays to dismiss the revision for want of merits.

4. Heard. Perused the papers. It is emerging that, present revision petitioner and respondent no.1 got married on 07.01.2015 and respondent no. 2 daughter was born out of their wedlock on 18.10.2016. Papers shows that, there are allegations of maltreatment after 15 days of marriage. There are allegations and counter allegations by the parties against each other.

5. On appreciating the oral and documentary evidence, learned Family Court decided Exhibit 149 in Petition No.E-34 of 2020 and in extenso dealt with each of the points raised on merits. Point No.2 regarding inability of wife and daughter to maintain themselves, has been answered in the affirmative. Stand of husband that wife earns by conducting business of beauty parlor, milk agency and tailoring work, has not been substantiated. Therefore, the entitlement of wife and daughter to receive maintenance is answered in the affirmative.

6. There seems to be discussion on the evidence adduced by the parties i.e. both oral and documentary evidence and the answers given by the parties in cross examination. Finally, learned Court has

considered that husband earns around Rs.1,01,336/- per month by way of net salary. Thereafter, quantum has been decided and operative part shows that, wife is directed to be paid Rs.20,000/- per month and daughter aged 4 at that point of time, she is held entitled to receive Rs.15,000/- per month.

7. Considering the take home salary and no concrete evidence to show that husband has other responsibilities asserted by him, this court does not find any error or infirmity on the part of learned Family Court in fixing about quantum. No case being made out on merits to interfere in the revision, the same deserves to be dismissed. Hence, the following order is passed :

ORDER

(i) The Criminal Revision Application is dismissed.

(ii) In view of dismissal of Revision Application, Criminal Application No.1505 of 2025 does not survive and is accordingly disposed of.

(ABHAY S. WAGHWASE, J.)