



CRP(MD). No.484 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 20.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

CRP(MD).No. 484 of 2026 and
CMP(MD).No.2150 of 2026

Raja

... Petitioner

Vs

Kokila

... Respondent

PRAYER :- Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India to call for the records pertaining to the order passed in I.A.No.02/2025 in HMOP.No.123 of 2019 on the file of the Court of Subordinate Judge, Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District dated 20.02.2025 and to set aside the same.

For Petitioner

: Mr.R. Babu Jeganath

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed to call for the records pertaining to the order passed in I.A.No.02/2025 in HMOP.No.123 of 2019 on the file of the Court of Subordinate Judge, Paramakudi,



CRP(MD). No.484 of 2026

Ramanathapuram District, dated 20.02.2025, and to set aside the same.

WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the materials available on record.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a daily wage labourer earning a sum of Rs.500/- per day. He contended that the trial court, without considering or calling for the assets and liabilities of either party, passed an order directing the petitioner to pay Rs.10,000/- per month as maintenance for his wife and Rs.2,500/- per month for the court's expenses. The petitioner submits that such an order is unfair, considering his limited income, and the trial court did not assess his actual financial capacity before imposing such a heavy burden.

4. The petitioner further submitted that the respondent / wife has purchased property, and the trial court has failed to consider this aspect while determining the maintenance amount. He argued that the trial court



CRP(MD). No.484 of 2026

should have examined the financial position of both parties before making the order, and its failure to do so constitutes an error in law.

5. The issue raised by the petitioner regarding the maintenance amount and the non-consideration of assets and liabilities of both parties is a matter that could be agitated before the trial court. After perusal of the record and hearing the submissions, this Court finds no infirmity in the order passed by the trial court. The trial court is empowered to decide maintenance based on the available evidence, and if the petitioner wishes to challenge the financial aspects, he can raise those issues before the trial court in an appropriate application.

6. The petitioner's contentions regarding his limited financial capacity and the respondent's property can be considered at the appropriate stage before the trial court. In the absence of any glaring error, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the trial court's order at this stage.



CRP(MD). No.484 of 2026

7. Accordingly, this Civil Revision Petition is dismissed. No costs.

Consequently, the connected Miscellaneous Petition is also closed.

20.02.2026

TRP

Index : yes / no

Internet: yes/ no

TO

The Subordinate Judge, Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.484 of 2026

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.,

trp

CRP(MD).No. 484 of 2026 and
CMP(MD).No.2150 of 2026

20.02.2026