



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED

CRL RC No. 585 of 2026

R. Subhakar, S/o. Rathinakaran,
No.184, Jawaharlal Nehru Street,
Anvarthikanpet Village, Arakkonam Taluk,
Ranipet District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Minor S.Dhanvi, D/o. Subhakar,
Rep.by by next friend / guardian cum her other
V.Jeevitha (The 2nd Petitioner herein)
residing at No.2, Sekarvarma Nagar, Tiruttani
Town and Taluk, Tiruvallur District - 631 209.

2. V.Jeevitha, W/o. Subhakar,
residing at No.2, Sekarvarma Nagar,
Tiruttani Town and Taluk,
Tiruvallur District - 631 209.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: To call for the entire records relating to the order passed in M.C.No.9 of 2024 dated 19.11.2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Tiruttani.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.C.Prakasam

For Respondent(s): Mr.K.T.S.Sivakumar for Mr.R.Ammu

ORDER

1. This Criminal Revision Case is filed to call for the records relating to the order, dated 19.11.2025, on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Tiruttani.
2. The facts of the case are that the Revision Petitioner and the 2nd Respondent got married on 06.12.2021 and the 1st Respondent is the minor female child,



born to them. Alleging that the Revision Petitioner is not taking of the Respondents, the Redpondents had filed MC.No.9 of 2024, seeking maintenance before the Trial Court. By the impunged order of the Trial Court, a sum of Rs.20,000/- p.m. was ordered to be paid to the Respondents (Rs.10000/= to the 2nd Respondent and Rs.10,000/- to the female child/1st Respondent) as maintenance and a sum of Rs.2,60,000/- was also ordered to be paid to the Respondents towards arrears. Hence, this Criminal Revision Case has been filed by the Revision Petitioner, seeking the relief, as stated above.

3. This Court heard Mr.C.Prakasam, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and Mr.K.T.S.Sivakumar for Ms.R.Ammu, the learned counsel for the Respondents.
4. The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has submitted that the court below failed to appreciate the fact that the 2nd Respondent voluntarily refused to live with the Petitioner, without any reasonable cause and that without considering the liabilities and the financial status of the Revision Petitioner, the Trial Court had passed the impugned order, granting maintenance to the tune of Rs.20,000/- p.m. to the 2nd Respondent and the female child/1st Respondent and that without proper application of mind, the impugned order had been passed in a mechanical manner and hence, this Criminal Revision Case is liable to be allowed, as prayed for.
5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Respondents has submitted that the



Trial Court had passed the impugned order, after duly considering the facts and circumstances of the case, as well as the statements of both the Petitioner and the Respondent. It is contended that, in such circumstances, and in order to meet the ends of justice, the impugned order does not warrant any interference by this Court. The amount of Rs.20,000/- as maintenance for the 2nd Respondent and her female child/1st Respondent, is not excessive. There is no illegality, impropriety, or perversity in the impugned order, nor does it reflect any abuse of the process of the Court.

6. This Court considered the submissions of the learned counsel on either side and also perused the entire materials placed on record.

7. The facts that the Revision Petitioner is the husband of the 2nd Respondent and they got a minor female child/1st Respondent, have not been denied. The amount fixed towards maintenance by the Court Below is Rs.20,000/- for the 2nd Respondent and the female child/1st Respondent, which, in the present days of rising prices and high cost of living, cannot be considered as excessive or disproportionate or unreasonable. The said monetary relief granted to the Respondents, by the courts below is adequate, fair and reasonable and consistent with the standard of living, to which the aggrieved person is accustomed. The provisions of Section 125 of Cr.PC are enacted to stop the vagrancy of a destitute wife and provide some succour to them, who are entitled to get the maintenance, which cannot be denied. Further, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has not been able to point out any



illegality or impropriety or incorrectness in the impugned orders, granting such quantum of maintenance, warranting interference by this Court.

8. In such circumstances, to meet the ends of justice, the impugned orders does not require any interference by this Court, as this court does not find any illegality or impropriety or incorrectness in the impugned orders and this Criminal Revision Case lacks merits and hence, it is liable to be dismissed.
9. In the result, the Criminal Revision Case stands **dismissed**, as devoid of merits. There is no order as to costs.

11-06-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

SRCM

1. Judicial Magistrate, Tiruttani
2. The Public Prosecutor, Madras High Court, Madras



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 585 of 2



SHAMIM AHMED, J.

SRCM

CRL RC No. 585 of 2026

11-06-2026