



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED

**CRL RC No. 2850 of 2025
CRL MP NO. 24597 OF 2025**

Karthi

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Kalaiyarasi, W/o.Karthi
2. Minor Sanjana, Rep by her Natural Guardian
cum Mother, the 1st respondent herein.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: This petition has been filed seeking to set aside the judgment dated 07.10.2025 passed in M.C.No.5 of 2022 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Tiruttani, and allow the above Criminal Revision Petition.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.V.Regunathan

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Suresh for Mr.A.Sasi Kumar

ORDER

1. This Criminal Revision Case is filed to set aside the order, dated 07.10.2025 passed in M.C.No.5 of 2022 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Tiruttani, and allow the above Criminal Revision Petition.
2. The facts of the case are that the Revision Petitioner and the 1st Respondent got married on 02.02.2014 and the 2nd Respondent is the minor child, born to them on 02.12.2014. Due to matrimonial dispute, it is alleged that the 1st Respondent was driven out of the matrimonial home. Hence, the 1st Redpondent had filed MC.No.46 of 2024, seeking maintenance before the



Trial Court. By the impugned 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 1st

Respondent and Rs.10,000/- to the child/2nd Respondent) as maintenance.

Hence, this Criminal Revision Case has been filed by the Revision Petitioner, seeking the relief, as stated above.

3. This Court heard Mr.V.Regunathan, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and Mr.S.Suresh for Mr.A.Sasikumar, 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 1st Respondent voluntarily refused to live with him, 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 1st Respondent and the child/2nd 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 1st Respondent and the child/2nd 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. It is further submitted by the learned counsel for the Respondents that the order of this Court, dated 19.12.2025 has not been complied with and that only a sum of Rs.3 lakhs was paid and the monthly maintenance of Rs.10,000/- p.m. was not paid by the Petitioner and that more than Rs.4,00,000/- is still pending. Thus, he submitted that this petition may be dismissed.

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

8. The facts that the Revision Petitioner is the husband of the 1st Respondent and they got a minor child/2nd Respondent, have not been denied. The matter has already been referred to mediation, but there is no agreement between the parties.

9. Pursuant to the order of this court dated 19.12.2025, directing the Petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- to the 2nd Respondent and continue to pay a sum Rs.10,000/- p.m. to the 2nd Respondent, only a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- has been paid and the Petitioner did not pay Rs.10,000/- p.m. to the 2nd Respondent. Thus, the order of this court, dated 19.12.2025 has not been complied with.



10.The amount fixed towards interim maintenance by the Court Below is Rs.20,000/- for the 1st Respondent and the child/2nd 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/child 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.

11.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.

12.In the result, the Criminal Revision Case stands **dismissed**, as devoid of merits. Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is closed. The respondents are directed to move an application before the trial Court for recovery of the arrears amount, in accordance with law.

22-06-2026



CRL RC No. 2850 of 2



Neutral Citation: Yes/No

WEB COPY
DN

To
The Judicial Magistrate, Tiruttani



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 2850 of 2



SHAMIM AHMED J.

DN

**CRL RC No. 2850 of 2025
AND
CRL MP NO. 24597 OF 2025**

22-06-2026