



C.R.P.No.3123 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Dated: 23.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE S.SOUNTHAR

C.R.P.No.3123 of 2025

and

C.M.P.No.17448 of 2025

G.Udayakumar

.... Petitioner

Vs

B.Bhuvaneswari

.... Respondent

Prayer: Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of Constitution of India, to set aside the order dated 18.03.2025 passed in I.A.No.984 of 2022 in M.O.P.No.316 of 2021 on the file of the Family Court at Puducherry, filed by the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Thiagarajan

For Respondent : Mr.R.Venkatesulu
for M/s.Usha Ramman

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition is filed challenging the order passed by the Family Court, Puducherry, directing the petitioner to pay interim maintenance of Rs.8,000/- per month to the respondent and a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month to the minor child.

1/6



C.R.P.No.3123 of 2025

WEB COPY

2. The petitioner/husband herein filed a divorce petition against the respondent/wife. Pending main original petition, the respondent filed an application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, seeking maintenance of Rs.30,000/- per month for herself and the minor child and also sought litigation expenses of Rs.10,000/-. The Family Court, Puducherry, by the impugned order, directed the petitioner to pay interim maintenance of Rs.8,000/- per month to the wife and Rs.5,000/- per month to the minor child. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner has come before this Court.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner fairly submitted that the petitioner is not questioning the portion of the order passed by the Family Court directing payment of interim maintenance to the minor child. Therefore, the present Civil Revision Petition is confined only to the portion of the order directing the petitioner to pay interim maintenance of Rs.8,000/- to the respondent/wife.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the respondent/wife voluntarily left the matrimonial home without any



C.R.P.No.3123 of 2025

reasonable cause and she is living separately without any justification.

Therefore, accordingly to the petitioner, the respondent is not entitled to claim maintenance. It is further submitted that as of today the petitioner is an unemployed and therefore, the quantum of interim maintenance passed by the Family Court is excessive. Though it is stated by the learned counsel for petitioner that the respondent/wife is living separately without justification, the fact remains that the marriage between the parties took place on 05.06.2020 and the petitioner/husband filed the divorce petition on 05.01.2021, within a short period from the date of marriage.

5. It is also seen from the typed set of papers that out of wedlock, a child was born to the respondent/wife. Though it is stated that the respondent/wife is living separately without justification, the petitioner has not shown any inclination for re-union. Instead of seeking restitution of conjugal rights, the petitioner filed a petition for divorce within a short period of marriage. Hence, the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the respondent/wife is living separately without justification is not acceptable.



C.R.P.No.3123 of 2025

WEB COPY

6. Coming to the quantum of interim maintenance, it is seen from the affidavit of assets and liabilities filed by the petitioner/husband that he is a B.Tech Degree holder with MBA. As far as the details of employment is concerned, the petitioner had stated that he was unemployed. However, during the course of cross-examination, the petitioner clearly admitted that he produced the details of three bank accounts before the Court and that the total transactions found in the bank accounts of the husband for a period of eighteen months goes to the tune of Rs.9,44,155. The petitioner attempted to explain the said transactions by saying that his father had used his UPI facility for bank transactions and therefore all the transactions found thereon were out of father's fund. However, when the petitioner's father was able to use UPI and transact to the tune of Rs.9,00,000/- and above within a period of three months through the petitioner's bank account, the petitioner failed to satisfactorily explain why such transactions were done through his accounts. Hence, the explanation offered by the petitioner/husband cannot be accepted.

7. Taking into consideration the educational qualification of the petitioner and the transactions that had taken place in his bank accounts,



C.R.P.No.3123 of 2025

the Family Court has fixed the moderate interim monthly maintenance.

Therefore, I do not find any serious error in the order passed by the Trial Court.

8. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed. No costs.

23.02.2026

Index : Yes/No
Internet : Yes/No
Neutral citation : Yes/No
Lpp

To
The Family Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY



C.R.P.No.3123 of 2025

S.SOUNTHAR, J.

Lpp

C.R.P.No.3123 of 2025

23.02.2026