



\$~38

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 326/2026 and CRL.M.A. 18662/2026**

RAMPHOOL SINGH AND ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Harvir Singh and Mr.Vishal,
Advocates.

versus

SARITARespondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **02.07.2026**

CRL.M.A. 18663/2026 (Condonation of delay)

1. For the reasons stated in the application, the same stands allowed. The delay of 26 days in filing the revision petition stands condoned.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 326/2026 and CRL.M.A. 18662/2026 (for stay)

1. The petitioner *vide* the instant petition seeks to challenge the order dated 17.12.2025 passed by the Family Court-02, North-East District, Karkardooma Family Courts, Delhi, whereby, interim maintenance of Rs.15,000/- per month (Rs.7,500/- by each of the petitioners) was directed to be paid to the respondent.
2. The facts of the instant case would indicate that the respondent had filed a petition under Section 125 of the C.r.P.C claiming to be a house wife



and legally married to petitioner no. 1. It was stated that she had no source of income. It was stated by the respondent that she had no movable and immovable property or any fixed asset/s in her name. Since, she was unable to maintain herself, therefore, the petition was instituted.

3. The Family Court has considered the facts and circumstances and found that there were multiple entries of the bank statement of petitioner no.1 of the year 2023 and entries of handsome amount such as Rs. 45,000/-, Rs.4,21,814/- and Rs.38,698/- were found. It has also been considered that petitioner no.1 is an able bodied person and he chose not to work any further. In these circumstances, his monthly income can also be calculated in terms of minimum wages of the current time when the application was adjudicated.

4. With respect to affidavit filed by petitioner no. 2, multiple entries were noted and it was also found that he was running Auto Spare parts shop. *Vide* paragraph no. 14 of the impugned order, it has been found that the deposits in the bank account of petitioner no. 2 were declined after December 2024 when the petition under Section 125 of the C.r.P.C was filed. The average income of the petitioner no.2 was assessed to be Rs.30,000/- per month.

5. Bearing in mind the overall facts and circumstances, the Court finds that the Family Court has rightly awarded the amount of interim maintenance i.e. Rs.15,000/- per month, which is a reasonable amount and is necessary for maintenance of the respondent. The same is, however, interim maintenance and shall remain subject to further adjudication during the course of proceedings under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C.

6. In view of the aforesaid, the Court in exercise of revisional



jurisdiction is not inclined to interfere into the impugned order. The instant revision petition stands failed and is, therefore, rejected.

PURUSHAINdra KUMAR KAURAV, J

JULY 2, 2026

Nc