



CRP(MD). No.169 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

Dated : 27.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR

**CRP(MD). No.169 of 2026
and
CMP(MD) No.662 of 2026**

S.Jeya Subash Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs

Saritha

... Respondent

PRAYER :-Civil Revision Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to set aside the Order and Decreetal order dated 12.11.2025 made in I.A. No. 3/2025 in H.M.O.P.No. 1465/2025 on the file of the Learned Family Court Judge, Padmanabhapuram Kanyakumari District.

For Petitioner : Mr.L.George Paul Anto

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order, dated 12.11.2025 made in IA.No.3 of 2025 in HMOP.No.1465 of 2025 on the file of the Family Court, Padmanabhapuram.

1/5



CRP(MD). No.169 of 2026

WEB COPY

2.The petitioner and the respondent are the husband and wife and the marriage between the parties was solemnized on 13.12.2009, according to Hindu Rites and Customs. Due to difference of opinion, the petitioner/husband has filed HMOP.No.1274 of 2021 against the respondent/wife before the Family Court at Nagercoil, seeking divorce, which was later transferred and renumbered as HMOP.No.1465 of 2025 pending on the file of the Family Court, Padmanabhapuram.

3.Pending HMOP, the respondent/wife filed I.A.No.3 of 2025 seeking interim alimony and the Court below, vide order, dated 12.11.2025, awarded a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month to the respondent towards maintenance along with a further direction to the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.10,000/- to the respondent towards litigation expenses. Challenging the same, the present Civil Revision Petition has been filed.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner reiterating all the contentions set out in the memorandum of grounds of Revision would submit that the petitioner borrowed bank loan to the tune of



CRP(MD). No.169 of 2026

Rs.35,00,000/- and is regularly paying monthly due of Rs.48,250/-.

Therefore, it is not possible for the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.15,000/- as ordered by the Court below per month towards maintenance to the respondent. Hence, he prays for appropriate orders.

5.I have considered the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner and also perused the record. Since no adverse order is going to be passed against the respondent, notice to the respondent is dispensed with.

6.The learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any such illegality or impropriety or incorrectness in the impugned order, which may persuade this Court to interfere with the same. The amount fixed for maintenance was Rs.15,000/- per month to the respondent, which, in the present days of rising prices and high cost of living, cannot be considered excessive or disproportionate. The provisions of [Section 125](#) of Cr.P.C are beneficial provisions, which are enacted to stop the vagrancy of a destitute wife and provide some



CRP(MD), No.169 of 2026

succour to them, who are entitled to get the maintenance, which cannot be denied. The fact that the petitioner is the husband of the respondent, has not been denied.

7.In such circumstances to meet the ends of justice, the impugned order does not require any interference. There is no illegality, impropriety and incorrectness in the impugned order and also there seems to be no abuse of Court's process.

8.In view of the above, this Civil Revision Petition lacks merit and stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition stands closed.

Speaking : Yes / No
NCC : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
mm

27.01.2026

To

The Judge, Family Court,
Padmanabhapuram, Kanyakumari District.

4/5



WEB COPY



CRP(MD). No.169 of 2026

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

mm

CRP(MD). No.169 of 2026

27.01.2026