



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3396]

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTY SECOND DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 440/2026

Between:

1.CHENNA MUKUND KUMAR REDDY, S/O CHENNA SUBRAMANYAM REDDY,AGED ABOUT 35 YEARS,PRESENTLY RESIDING AT 4442 HANNOVER WAY,ROUND ROCK, TEXAS - 78681, USAREPRESENTED BY ITS GPACHENNA SUBRAMANYAM REDDY, S/O LATE C.MUNI REDDY,AGED ABOUT 65 YEARS RESIDIN TIRUCHANOR ROAD, TIRUPATI,

...PETITIONER

AND

1.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP BY ITS. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,HIGH COURT OF A.P AT AMARAVATHI-522239.
2.V GEETHIKA REDDY, W/O CHENNA MUKUND KUMAR REDDYD/O V. VIJAYA SEKHAR, AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS,R/AT D.NO. 27-57-18-5, CHANDRAKANTH STREET,PUNGANUR, ANNAMAYYA DISTRICT-517247.

...RESPONDENT(S):

Revision filed under Section 397/401 of CrPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the Criminal Revision Case, the High Court may be pleased to Memorandum of Criminal Revision Case under Sections 438 and 442 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, being aggrieved by the order dated 06-03-2026 passed in CrI.M.P. No.26 of 2025 in M.C. No.1 of 2025 by the learned I Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Punganur

IA NO: 1 OF 2026

Petition under Section 151 CPC praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, the High Court may be pleased to suspend the operation and execution of the order dated 06-03-2026 passed in CrI.M.P. No.26 of 2025 in M.C. No.1 of 2025 on the file of the I Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Punganur pending disposal of the main CRLRC, and to pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.O UDAYA KUMAR

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 440/2026****JUDGMENT:**

This Criminal Revision Case has been filed by the petitioner aggrieved by the order dated 06.03.2026 passed in CrI.M.P.No.26 of 2025 in M.C. No.1 of 2025 by the learned I Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Punganur, granting interim maintenance of Rs.33,000/- per month to the respondent No.2/wife.

2. Heard Sri O.Udaya Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mrs.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor representing on behalf of the State.

3. The respondent No.2/wife filed M.C. No.1 of 2025 on the file of learned I Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Punganur, seeking maintenance against the petitioner. During the pendency of the said M.C., she filed a petition for interim maintenance, wherein, the learned Judge after taking into the consideration the facts and circumstances of the case at hand, granted interim maintenance of Rs.33,000/- per month to the wife of the petitioner. Aggrieved by the said order, the present revision is preferred.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the interim maintenance granted by the learned Trial Court is on the higher side. The learned Judge failed to consider the substantial recurring expenses and the existing financial liabilities borne by the petitioner. It is also contended that the

Trial Court failed to note that Respondent No. 2, the wife of the petitioner, lived with him for only about fifteen days after the marriage. She is highly educated and had previously worked at Apollo 24/7 in Gurugram.

5. Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor would submit that the Court may pass appropriate orders, as the impugned order pertains only to interim maintenance.

6. As can be seen from the record, the present revision has been preferred against the order granting interim maintenance. A perusal of the impugned order indicates that it is not in dispute that the wife is residing separately from the petitioner, nor is there any dispute regarding the relationship between the petitioner herein and respondent No.2. The contentions raised in the present revision are disputed questions of fact, and this is not the appropriate stage to determine the genuineness or otherwise of the claims made by the petitioner. The learned Trial Judge, after taking into consideration the material placed before him, passed the impugned order. Hence, this Court is of the view that there are no grounds warranting interference with the said order.

7. Considering the submissions made, since this revision is preferred challenging the order dated 06.03.2026 passed in CrI.M.P.No.26 of 2025 in M.C. No.1 of 2025 by the learned I Additional Judicial Magistrate of First Class, Punganur, granting interim maintenance of Rs.33,000/- per month to the respondent No.2 /wife, it is apposite to dispose of the present revision without causing any prejudice to the rights and contentions of the respective

parties with a direction to the learned Trial Judge to dispose of the main case i.e., MC No.1 of 2025, as expeditiously as possible without granting any adjournment in a casual way by mere asking, preferably within a period of three (3) months from the date of receipt of copy of this judgment. The parties are at liberty to raise all their contentions before the Trial Court during the course of enquiry. Learned Trial Judge may appreciate the same and take appropriate decision according to law, without being influenced by any observation made by this Court in the present revision.

8. With the above observations, the Criminal Revision Case is disposed of at the stage of admission.

Consequently, miscellaneous applications pending, if any, shall stand closed.

DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date: 22.04.2026.

UPS

134

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 440/2026

Dt.22.04.2026

UPS