



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED

CRL RC No. 1135 of 2026

Arivarasan, S/o. Angalan,
No.20, Palla Street One,
Uthiravaginipet, Villianur,
Pondicherry-605 110.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

Vijayalakshmy, W/o. Arivarasan,
No.31, 2nd Vanniyar Street,
Kanuvapet, Puducherry-605 110.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:- This Criminal Revision Case is filed, to call for the records, relating to the order, dated 12.02.2026, passed in Crl.A.No.95 of 2025, by the III Additional Sessions Judge, Pondicherry, confirming the order dated, 13.05.2025, passed in Crl.MP.No.3973 of 2024, in DVC.No.264 of 2024, by the Judicial Magistrate, Mahila Court, Pondicherry and to set aside the same.

For Petitioner(s): Ms.M. Mohanapriya

ORDER

1. This Criminal Revision Case is filed, to call for the records relating to the order, dated 12.02.2026, passed in Crl.A.No.95 of 2025, by the III Additional Sessions Judge, Pondicherry, confirming the order dated, 13.05.2025, passed in Crl.MP.No.3973 of 2024, in DVC.No.264 of 2024, by the Judicial Magistrate, Mahila Court, Pondicherry and to set aside the same.

2. The facts of the case are that the Revision Petitioner and the Respondent got



married on 26.09.2017 and a girl child was born to them on 18.09.2018. Due to matrimonial dispute, the Respondent had filed DVC.No.264 of 2024 before the Trial Court and also an interim maintenance application, in Crl.MP.No.3973 of 2024, under Section 23(1) and (2) read with Section 20 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. By the impugned order of the Trial Court, a sum of Rs.7,500/- (Rs.2,500/- to Wife and Rs.5,000/- to child) p.m. was ordered to be paid to the Respondent, as an interim maintenance. The appeal in Crl.A.No.95 of 2025 filed by the Revision Petitioner as against the said order of the Trial Court was dismissed. Hence, this Criminal Revision Case has been filed by the Revision Petitioner, seeking the relief, as stated above.

3. This Court heard Ms.M.Mohanapriya, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner.
4. The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has submitted that though his gross salary is Rs.57,538/- p.m., after statutory deductions and monthly loan instalments, his net take home salary is Rs.15,417/- and that the Revision Petitioner is also taking care of his parents and that the Respondent is residing separately from the Revision Petitioner, without any just or reasonable cause, and as such, she is not entitled to claim maintenance from the Revision Petitioner and that though the Revision Petitioner is willing to resume cohabitation, the Respondent has not come forward to resume cohabitation. However, both the courts below, without properly appreciating the said facts



and evidence available on record, had erroneously awarded an excessive and unreasonable interim maintenance to the tune of Rs.7,500/- per month, to the

Respondent and hence, this Criminal Revision Case is liable to be allowed, as prayed for.

5. This Court considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and also perused the materials placed on record.

6. The facts that the Revision Petitioner is the husband of the Respondent and they got a female child, have not been denied. The amount fixed towards maintenance by the Courts Below is Rs.7,500/- for both the Respondent and the Child, 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 Respondent, 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 the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 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.

7. 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.

8. In the result, the Criminal Revision Case stands **dismissed**, as devoid of merits. There is no order as to costs.

04-06-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

SRCM



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1135 of 2



SHAMIM AHMED, J.

SRCM

CRL RC No. 1135 of 2026

04-06-2026