



2026:CGHC:1046

NAFR

CRR No. 137 of 2023

1. Smt. Meena Lahre W/o Nyaymurti Lahre Aged About 38 Years House Wife, R/o Avantika Colony G-13 Jagdalpur Police Station Bodhghat District Bastar Chhattisgarh
2. Ku. Pranjal Lahre D/o Nyaymurti Lahre Aged About 13 Years Through Natural Mother Meena Lahre R/o Avantika Colony G-13 Jagdalpur Police Station Bodhghat District Bastar Chhattisgarh
3. Ku. Akansha Lahre D/o Nyaymurti Lahre Aged About 10 Years Through Natural Mother Meena Lahre R/o Avantika Colony G-13 Jagdalpur Police Station Bodhghat District Bastar Chhattisgarh
4. Ku. Ananya Lahre D/o Nyaymurti Lahre Aged About 3 Years Through Natural Mother Meena Lahre R/o Avantika Colony G-13 Jagdalpur Police Station Bodhghat District Bastar Chhattisgarh

... Applicants**versus**

Nyaymurti Lahre S/o Late Nanhuram Lahre Aged About 42 Years Caste Satnami Occupation Senior Auditor, Office Deputy Director Local Finance Samparikcha R/o Infront of Santosh Medical Shop Lalbag Maidan Jagdalpur District Bastar Chhattisgarh

... Respondent

For Applicants : Mr. Awadh Tripathi, Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr. Pravin Kumar Tulsyan, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

07.01.2026

1. Heard Mr. Awadh Tripathi, learned counsel, appearing for the applicants.
Also heard Mr. Pravin Kumar Tulsyan, learned counsel, appearing for the respondent.
2. The present revision has been filed by the applicants with the following prayer:

“It is therefore, prayed that the application may kindly be allowed and thereby the applicants may kindly be provided proper maintenance amount from the respondent.”

3. Facts of the case are that on 19.07.2021, the applicant, Smt. Meena Lahre, filed an application for grant of monthly maintenance for herself and her minor daughters, namely Ku. Pranjal Lahre, Ku. Akansha Lahre, and Ku. Ananya Lahre, who were arrayed as applicant Nos. 2 to 4, against her husband, who is the respondent and the father of applicant Nos. 2 to 4, before the Court of the learned Judge, Family Court, Bastar at Jagdalpur (C.G.). The said application was registered as Criminal Miscellaneous Case No. 79/2021. The applicant, Smt. Meena Lahre, stated in her application that from the lawful wedlock between her and the respondent, three daughters were born, namely Ku. Pranjal Lahre, Ku. Akansha Lahre, and Ku. Ananya Lahre. She further alleged that after the birth of the second daughter, Ku. Akansha Lahre, when she again became pregnant, the respondent stated that if she delivered another female child, he would divorce her. It was further alleged that during the said pregnancy, the respondent got medical inquiries conducted and,

upon coming to know that the child in the womb was female, attempted to get the pregnancy terminated. However, the applicant refused to undergo abortion, and the doctors also declined to perform the procedure due to the advanced stage of pregnancy, i.e., seven to eight months. Thereafter, the applicant left the respondent and started residing in a rented house. It was further alleged that the respondent failed to discharge his obligation to maintain the applicants.

4. It was also stated that applicant No.2, Ku. Pranjal Lahre, and applicant No.3, Ku. Akansha Lahre, are students studying at St. Xavier's Convent School, Jagdalpur, and applicant No.4 is a minor child. Despite sincere efforts made by applicant No.1 and her family members, the respondent did not agree to reside with the applicants. The applicants further stated that the respondent is working as a Senior Auditor in the Directorate of Local Fund Accounts Examiner, Jagdalpur, and is earning a salary of approximately Rs. 50,000/- per month. It was pleaded that the respondent is financially capable of maintaining the applicants, therefore, the applicants prayed for grant of maintenance of Rs. 40,000/- per month.
5. Upon issuance of notice, the respondent, Nyayamurti Lahre, appeared before the learned Family Court and filed his written statement. He pleaded that in the year 2010, he was allotted Government Quarter No. G-13 at Avantika Colony, Jagdalpur, and prior thereto, he was residing at Vrindavan Colony, Jagdalpur. He further stated that thereafter, till the year 2018, he resided along with the applicants in the said government quarter at Avantika Colony. At present, the respondent is residing in a residential house at Kumharpara, Jagdalpur.
6. The respondent further stated that he is serving as a Senior Auditor in the

Directorate of Local Fund Accounts Examiner, Jagdalpur, and is drawing a gross salary of Rs. 54,754/-, out of which, after deductions under various heads, he receives a net salary of Rs. 29,379/- per month. He further submitted that he is already paying monthly maintenance in compliance with the order dated 24.04.2018 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class in Criminal Case No. 21/2018. It was also stated that an amount of Rs. 3,309/- is being deducted from his salary towards rent of the residential premises. He further submitted that he has deposited the total school fees of Rs. 47,466/- for his three daughters and is also paying Rs. 3,000/- per month to an auto driver for transportation of the children to and from school. He further paid Rs. 1,310/- as school admission fees for his third daughter, Ku. Ananya Lahre, and has also borne the expenses of school uniforms for his daughters.

7. After considering the pleadings of the parties, the learned Family Court framed five issues and proceeded to record evidence. After examination-in-chief and cross-examination of the applicant and the respondent and their respective witnesses, the learned Family Court, vide order dated 20.12.2022, granted maintenance of Rs. 2,000/- each to Applicant Nos. 1 to 3 and Rs. 1,000/- to Applicant No.4, Ku. Ananya Lahre, totaling Rs. 7,000/- per month in favour of the applicants.
8. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the learned trial Court has erroneously recorded its findings with regard to Issue No. 2. Although the Court has held that the respondent has sufficient means, it has also observed that it was not proved that the respondent had neglected to maintain the applicants. However, in paragraph 9 of the impugned order, the learned Court itself has recorded that the respondent paid tuition fees

for only one month and thereafter the applicant herself paid the tuition fees. Despite this, the learned trial Court concluded that the respondent had not completely failed to discharge his obligation to maintain the applicants for the last four years and, on that basis, directed that the maintenance amount be increased, which is contrary to the findings recorded. He further submits that as per the deductions made under various heads from the gross salary of the respondent, the learned Court has observed that the respondent receives a net salary of Rs. 38,633/- per month. Thereafter, as discussed in paragraph 12 of the impugned order while deciding Issue No. 4, the learned Court has taken into consideration that the applicant is already receiving Rs. 8,000/- per month as maintenance under the Domestic Violence Act. Despite such findings, while considering the question as to whether the applicant is entitled to maintenance of Rs. 40,000/- per month, the learned Court has awarded maintenance of Rs. 2,000/- each to Applicant Nos. 1 to 3 and Rs. 1,000/- to Applicant No. 4, totaling Rs. 7,000/- per month.

- 9.** On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the respondent opposes the prayers and submissions made by learned counsel for the applicants.
- 10.** I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the pleadings and documents appended thereto.
- 11.** From perusal of the impugned order, it transpires that the learned Family Court, after considering all the documents and evidence adduced by the parties, has partly allowed the application under Section 125 of the CrPC filed by the applicants. The Court has awarded the maintenance of Rs. 2000/- each to the applicant No. 1 to 3 and Rs. 1000/- to applicant No. 4, observing the income, social and economic status of both the parties and

current price index, which cannot be said to be on lower side.

12. Considering the submission advanced by the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the impugned order and the finding recorded by the learned Family Court, I am of the view that the learned Family Court has not committed any illegality or infirmity or jurisdictional error in the impugned order warranting interference by this Court.
13. Accordingly, the criminal revision, being devoid of merit, is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Abhishek