



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 268 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SHAMIM AHMED

CRL RC No. 268 of 2026

D.Prewin Kumar, S/o Duraisamy,
D.No.14/38, Thottapaguthigal,
Ikkaraipooluvampatti, Coimbatroe.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

S.Keerthana, D/o A.Selvaraj,
D.No.91/24, Kattabomman Nagar,
PNP Road, Tiruppur.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:-To set aside the orders dated 22.09.2025 in M.C.No.106 of 2024 on the file of the Principal Family Court, Tiruppur, and allow the above Criminal Revision Petition.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.J.Maheswaran

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Muthu Kumar

ORDER

1. This Criminal Revision Case is filed to set aside the order, dated 22.09.2025, passed in MC.No.106 pf 2024, by the Principal Family Court, Tiruppur.
2. The facts of the case are that the Revision Petitioner/Husband and the Respondent/Wife got married on 22.02.2015 and out of their wed lock, two children, Sathurvidha dnd Sathvick, were born on 28.12.2015 and 11.07.2020, respectively. Due to matrimonial dispute, the Respondent left the matrimonial home and had filed MC.No.106 of 2024, seeking



maintenance. By the impugned order, a sum of Rs.17,500/- p.m. was ordered to be paid to the Respondent (Rs.7,500/-) and her two children, namely, Sathurvidha and Sathvick, (Rs.10,000/-) 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.J.Maheswaran, the learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner and Mr.S.Muthu Kumar, the learned counsel for the Respondent.
4. The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner has submitted that the Respondent had left the matrimonial home on her own volition and that without assessing the financial capacity of the Revision Petitioner and the means and ability of the Respondent to maintain herself and her two children, the Trial Court had passed the impugned order, granting interim maintenance to the tune of Rs.17,500/- p.m. to the Respondent and her two children and that the impugned order had been passed in a mechanical manner hence, this Criminal Revision Case is liable to be allowed, as prayed for.
5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the Respondent 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.17,500/- as interim maintenance



for the Respondent and her two children is not too much. 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 Respondent and they got two children have not been denied. The amount fixed towards interim maintenance by the Court Below is Rs.17,500/- for the Respondent and the two Children, 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 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.

12-06-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

SRCM



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 268 of 2



SHAMIM AHMED, J.

SRCM

CRL RC No. 268 of 2026

12-06-2026