

1
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH
AT INDORE**

**BEFORE
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE VIVEK RUSIA**

ON THE 31st OF JULY, 2023

CRIMINAL REVISION No. 25 of 2018

BETWEEN:-

**BHAGWANSINGH S/O GHEESALAL, AGED ABOUT 26
YEARS, OCCUPATION: LABOUR VILLAGE JAMUNIYA
GANESH, P.S.KURAVAR TEH.NARSINGHGARH
(MADHYA PRADESH)**

.....PETITIONER

(BY HARISH CHANDRA TRIPATHI-ADVOCATE)

AND

- 1. SMT.SANJNA W/O BHAGWANSINGH, AGED
ABOUT 24 YEARS, OCCUPATION: LABOUR
JAMUNIYA GANESH, DISTT.RAJGAD/ AT PRESENT
ADD : DHOBI MOHALLA JEERAPUR, TEH.AND
P.S.JEERAPUR DISTT.RAJGAD (MADHYA
PRADESH)**
- 2. RAJVEER S/O BHAGWANSINGH, AGED ABOUT 4
YEARS, JAMUNIYA GANESH AT PRESENT ADD:
DHOBI MOHALLA JEERAPUR, TEHSIL ND P.S.
JEERAPUR, DISTT. RAJGHAR, (MADHYA
PRADESH)**

.....RESPONDENTS

(NONE FOR THE RESPONDENTS)

.....
*This revision coming on for orders this day, the court passed the
following:*

ORDER

This revision has been filed against the order dated 23.11.2017 passed by Principal Judge, Family Court, Rajgarh in Case No.330/2015 whereby an application filed under Section 125 of Cr.P.C. by the respondents wife and son has been allowed applicant/husband was directed to pay the maintenance of

Rs.1700/- and 800 per month to the respondent No.1 and respondent No.2 respectively in total Rs.2500/- from date of order.

2. The marriage between the husband and wife was solemnized 6 years ago from 2015. Thereafter, wife gave birth a son namely Rajveer. Because of ill-treatment meted out to her, she left the house and started living with her parents. According to her, after giving birth to son behavior of the applicant/husband did not improve. She was compelled to leave the house and she has no other source of income, therefore, approached the Family court claiming maintenance of Rs.5000/- each in total Rs.10,000/-.

3. The respondent/appeared and filed reply by submitting that she is doing the work of supervision in a manufacturing unit of bricks of her parents and earning well.

4. After appreciating the evidence that came on record, the learned Family court has allowed the application in part and held that without any reason and justification, the respondent No.1/wife has been deserted by the husband/applicant. The husband is a healthy and young person and earning Rs.150-200 per day. The husband is already paying Rs.1000/- and Rs.500 respectively in compliance of the order dated 28.02.2017, thus awarded Rs. 1700/- and Rs. 800/- respectively in addition to above. Now more than 6 years have been passed. There is no revision by the wife or son for enhancement of maintenance amount, thus looking to the price index and inflation, the maintenance amount is just and proper and cannot be said to higher side.

In view of above, revision is dismissed.

(VIVEK RUSIA)

Praveen

