

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Revision No. 455 of 2025

Md. Samir Akhtar @ Bablu, S/o Md. Amin Qureshi, R/o Maulana Azad Chowk, Main Road, Giridih, P.O. & P.S.- Giridih, District-Giridih

..... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Aasiya Sultana, W/o Md. Samir Akhtar @ Bablu, D/o Md. Mukhtar Qureshi, R/o Purana Bazar, Near Jora Imambara, P.O.-Gomoh, P.S.-Hariharpur, District-Dhanabd

... Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GAUTAM KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Kamdeo Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Abhay Kishore, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Praful Jojo, APP

Order No. 04 / Dated : 31.07.2025.

1. The instant criminal revision petition has been filed against the order of maintenance of Rs.6000/- per month passed under Section 125 Cr.P.C. in favour of opposite party no. 2.
2. Learned Family Court recorded a finding that the petitioner was married to opposite party no. 2 on 02.05.2012 and three children were born from the wedlock.
3. As per the disclosure made in the asset and liability of the applicant/opposite party no. 2, the petitioner was having a small shop of bags from which he had a monthly income of Rs.1,50,000/- and also has income of Rs 30,000 from the rent. However, no documentary evidence could be filed in this regard.
4. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that all the three children are living with the petitioner and he is maintaining them, whereas opposite party no. 2 is living in her parental home at Dhanbad. It is further submitted that opposite party no. 2 at times partly sits in the shop of her brother and gains income from the said bangle shop. It is also submitted that the petitioner was deaf and dumb the source of income was Rs 1000/-that he got from the Social Welfare Department in view of his handicap.
5. Learned counsel for the State has defended the impugned order.
6. On perusal of the deposition of opposite party no. 2 made in para-9, it has been submitted that her husband was having a shop under the name and Lovely Bag House at Giridih and his house was also rented out. There is no

cross-examination on this point. The deposition of the OP No.2 regarding it has remained unrebutted. In this view of the matter, the maintenance of Rs.6000/- awarded does not appear to be excessive, so as to warrant interference in the exercise of revisional jurisdiction.

Criminal Revision, accordingly, stands dismissed.

Pending I.A., if any stands dismissed.

(Gautam Kumar Choudhary, J.)

Pawan/ -