



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

[3396]

WEDNESDAY, THE SIXTH DAY OF MAY
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY SIX

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 443/2020

Between:

1.SAYANA SIVAJI,, S/O. SUBBA RAO AGED ABOUT 38 YEARS, R/O.
D.NO.25/520, BHASKARAPURAM, MACHILIPATNAM, KRISHNA
DISTRICT

...PETITIONER

AND

1.SAYANA USHA RANI, W/O. SIVAJI, D/O. TANNERU SRIDHAR, AGE
35 YEARS, R/O.D.NO.16-8, NEAR RYTHU BAZAAR, KANKIPADU
VILLAGE AND MANDAL, KRISHNA DISTRICT.

2.SAYANA HEMA SRI, D/O. S. SIVAJI, MOTHER'S PROTECTION,
(2ND RESPONDENT BEING MINOR, REP. BY HER MOTHER AND
NATURAL GUARDIAN I.E., 1ST RESPONDENT)

3.THE STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, REP. BY PUBLIC
PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH,
AMARAVATHI.

...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 topleased to set aside the order and decreetal order dated 20.10.2020 passed by the Judge Prl. Family Court-cum-IV Addl. District Judge, Vijayawada passed in M.C.No.290 of 2017 and pass

Counsel for the Petitioner:

1.V V VARADA RAJULU

Counsel for the Respondent(S):

1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR (AP)

2.SIREESHA RANI VALLABHANENI

The Court made the following:

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA**CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 443 of 2020****ORDER:**

The present Criminal Revision Case has been filed under Section 438 and 442 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, challenging the Order dated 20.10.2020 in M.C.No.290 of 2017 on the file of the learned Principal Family Court-cum-IV Additional District Judge, Vijayawada.

2. Heard Sri V. V. Varada Rajulu, learned counsel for the revision petitioner and Mrs.K.Priyanka Lakshmi, learned Assistant Public Prosecutor takes notice on behalf of the State/1st respondent.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner herein is the husband of respondent No.1 and father of respondent No.2, a minor represented by her mother and natural guardian, respondent No.1. It is submitted that respondent Nos.1 and 2 filed M.C.No.290 of 2017 seeking maintenance of Rs.30,000/- per month for respondent No.1 and Rs.20,000/- per month for respondent No.2. It is further contended that the learned Trial Judge, without properly considering the financial constraints and statutory liabilities of the petitioner, including his personal expenses, dependent family members and other unavoidable commitments, awarded maintenance of Rs.15,000/- each to respondent Nos.1 and 2 from the date of the petition.

4. Considering the submissions made, and upon perusal of the material available on record and the impugned order, it is evident that the petitioner is working in L.I.C. as a Development Officer and is earning about Rs.60,000/-

per month towards salary and about Rs.40,000/- towards commission, apart from having landed properties. Further, as rightly observed by the learned Trial Court, the petitioner failed to establish that respondent No.1 has any independent source of income to maintain herself and the minor child. Taking the said facts into consideration, the learned Trial Judge granted maintenance of Rs.15,000/- each to respondent Nos.1 and 2.

5. This Court, while exercising revisional jurisdiction, does not sit as a Court of appeal. The scope of interference in revision is limited and can be exercised only when there is patent illegality, material irregularity, jurisdictional error, or perversity in the order passed by the Trial Court. Unless the findings recorded by the learned Trial Judge are manifestly erroneous or suffer from perversity, this Court would not be justified in interfering with the same. In the present case, this Court does not find any such infirmity or miscarriage of justice warranting interference.

6. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, this Court finds no grounds to entertain the revision against the impugned order. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed.

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

DR. JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

Date: 06.05.2026.

ARB

THE HONOURABLE DR JUSTICE VENKATA JYOTHIRMAI PRATAPA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE NO: 443/2020

Dt.06.05.2026

ARB