SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			CRLR/844/2026 Rohit Sati --Revisionist **Versus** State Of Uttarakhand and another --Respondents **Hon'ble Siddhartha Sah, J.** Mr. Girish Chandra Lakhchaura, learned counsel for the revisionist. 2. Mr. Shailendra Singh Chauhan, learned D.A.G. assisted by Mr. Vikash Uniyal, learned Brief Holder for the State. 3. By means of the present Revision, the revisionist has assailed the order dated 07.08.2026, passed by the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Haldwani, District Nainital by means of which interim maintenance of ₹15,000 has been granted by the said Court to the respondent wife. 4. On a query made to the learned counsel for the revisionist, he would submit that the monthly salary as per his affidavit in compliance of judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Rajnesh vs. Neha is ₹63,000. However, a perusal of the impugned order dated 07.08.2026 would reveal that a specific finding has been recorded by the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court,

			Haldwani that from the salary slip of the month of December, 2023 of the revisionist, the revisionist is serving in company by the name of Pidilite Industries Limited in the capacity of Zonal Training In-charge and he is drawing a salary of ₹73,109, and even after the deductions, he is getting a net salary of ₹67,932 per month. 5. Assailing the order impugned, the learned counsel for the revisionist would submit that the respondent wife is residing at her aunt's home without any rhyme or reason on her own sweet will, and therefore, the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court erred by granting interim maintenance and allowing the application for interim maintenance and granting interim maintenance of ₹15,000. 6. Learned counsel for the revisionist further submits that he is all along been ready and willing to keep the respondent wife with him, and in fact, he has earlier instituted a suit under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act before the Family Court at Lucknow, which unfortunately got dismissed for non-prosecution; however, the restoration application for the restoration of the said case is pending. 7. Since it is not disputed that the respondent is the wife of the revisionist, and it is also not disputed that the monthly salary as per the own salary slip of the revisionist is ₹73,109, and which upon deductions, the net salary would be ₹67,932, this

			Court does not find any error in the impugned order whereby interim maintenance to the tune of ₹15,000 has been granted by the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court. 8. However, all the contentions as are being raised by the learned counsel for the revisionist would be available to him to be agitated in the main maintenance application, and any observation made hereinbefore will not come in the way of the final adjudication of the application under Section 144 of the BNSS. 9. In view of the aforesaid, there is no force in the present Revision and the same is dismissed accordingly. **(Siddhartha Sah, J.)** 03.11.2026 Shiv/