HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION DEFECTIVE No. - 1945 of 2026

Meva Lal Chaurasiya

.....Revisionist(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite Party(s)

Counsel for Revisionist(s)	:	Anurodh Tripathi
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 83

HON'BLE PRAVEEN KUMAR GIRI, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the revisionist and learned A.G.A. for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the revisionist submits that the present criminal revision has been filed seeking relief as mentioned in the prayer clause along with delay condonation application as there is delay of 327 days in filing this revision. The prayer clause is delineated below:-

> *"It is therefore, Most Respectfully prayed that this Honble Court may graciously be pleased to set aside the impugned order dated 01.08.2025 passed by Principal Judge, Family Court, Sonbhadra in Misc. Case No. 113 of 2023 [Sandhya Vs. Mewa Lal], U/Sec. 125 Cr.P.C., P.S.- Robertsganj, District-Sonbhadra whereby the Principal Judge, Family Court, Sonbhadra has granted interim maintenance @ Rs. 2,000/- per month from the date of order dated 01.08.2025 on the 10th day of every month to the Opposite Party No.2.*
>
> *And/or pass such other and appropriate order which this Honble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case, otherwise the revisionist shall suffer irreparable loss and injury."*

3. Learned counsel for the revisionist submits that the Trial Court, vide impugned order dated 01.08.2025, has awarded interim maintenance of Rs.2,000/- per month to opposite party No. 2-wife from the date of the order. It is submitted that the quantum of maintenance awarded by the

Trial Court is exorbitant and is not commensurate with the source of income of the revisionist and, therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside.

4. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the revisionist and upon perusal of the impugned order, this Court finds that the amount of Rs.2,000/- per month awarded as interim maintenance is a meagre amount and does not warrant any interference by this Court. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served in calling for a counter affidavit from opposite party No. 2.

5. Accordingly, the revision is dismissed on the ground of delay as well as on the ground that the quantum of maintenance awarded is meagre.

6. However, the Trial Court, i.e. the Principal Judge Family Court, Sonbhadra, is directed to decide the pending application filed under Section 125 Cr.P.C./144 BNSS within a period of six months from today, after providing adequate opportunity of hearing to both the parties and without granting any unnecessary adjournment to either of the parties.

(Praveen Kumar Giri,J.)

October 6, 2026
DKS

Digitally signed by :-
DEEPAK KUMAR SRIVASTWA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad