



2026:CGHC:3087

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 506 of 2023

Kamal Narayan Verma S/o Late Harish Chandra Verma Aged About 42 Years
R/o Village Dundera, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh. Present Address
Mayur Grafiks Shop Number 22 New D Market Sector-6, Bhilai Nagar, Tahsil
And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

versus

1. Smt. Sarita Verma W/o Kamal Narayan Verma Aged About 39 Years R/o
Sheetala Mandir Ke Paas Goverdhan Nagar Bhanpuri Tahsil And
District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Minor Kumari Srishti Verma D/o Kamal Narayan Verma Aged About 15
Years Minor Through Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Sarita Verma W/o
Kamal Narayan Verma, R/o Sheetala Mandir Ke Paas Goverdhan Nagar
Bhanpuri Tahsil And District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Minor Kumari Navya Verma D/o Kamal Narayan Verma Aged About 11
Years Minor Through Natural Guardian Smt. Sarita Verma, W/o Kamal
Narayan Verma, R/o Sheetala Mandir Ke Paas Goverdhan Nagar
Bhanpuri Tahsil And District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh

... Respondents

For Applicant	: Mr. Vikas Kumar Pandey, Advocate.
For Respondents	: None

Hon'ble Mr. Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

19.01.2026

1. Heard Mr. Vikas Kumar Pandey, learned counsel, appearing for the applicant.
2. None appeared on behalf of the respondents to press this revision when the case is called out of hearing.
3. The present revision has been filed by the applicant with the following prayer:

“1. That the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to call for the entire record pertaining to the present case.

2. That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow this revision and further be pleased to set aside the order dated 04/02/2023 (Annexure A/1), Passed by the Learned First Additional Principle Judge Family Court Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.).

3. That this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to pass any other order in the favour of the applicant as it may deem to fit and proper under the facts and circumstance of the cases.”

4. Brief facts of the case are that the respondents filed an application under Section 125 of the Cr.P.C. before the learned Family Court seeking grant of maintenance from the applicant. The marriage between the applicant and respondent No. 1 was solemnized on 28.03.2004, in accordance with Hindu rites and customs, at Tatavahi, District Kawardha (C.G.), and respondent Nos. 2 and 3 were born out of the said wedlock. It was alleged by the respondent that the applicant did not take proper care of

her and that the applicant used to quarrel with her. In such circumstances, the respondent, along with her children, left the matrimonial home and went to reside at her parental home.

5. The applicant filed a reply to the application filed by the respondent, denying all the allegations and taking a specific plea that the respondent had voluntarily chosen to live separately. It was further pleaded that the respondent left the matrimonial home without any just or sufficient reason and, therefore, the applicant is not liable to pay any maintenance.
6. On 04.02.2023, the learned Family Court passed an order in favour of the respondents and directed the applicant to pay Rs. 5,000/- per month to respondent No. 1 and Rs. 1,000/- per month each to respondent Nos. 2 and 3 towards maintenance.
7. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the impugned order passed by the learned Family Court is bad in law, perverse, and not based on proper appreciation of evidence, and is therefore liable to be set aside. He also submits that the learned Family Court has failed to properly appreciate the facts and evidence available on record while passing the impugned order. He further submits that the impugned order passed by the learned Family Court suffers from serious factual and legal infirmities. The financial condition of the applicant is weak, and he is not in a position to pay the maintenance amount as directed. He further submits that on 28.02.2013, the applicant and respondent No. 1 filed a divorce petition by mutual consent before the learned Family Court, Durg, which was allowed on 16.12.2013. The impugned order is illegal, arbitrary, and bad in law, and therefore deserves to be set aside.
8. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant and perused the judgment of the learned Family Court.

9. Considering the submission advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant, materials available on record and also considering the price index and medical expenses, total amount awarded to the respondents cannot be said to be shockingly on higher side warranting interference by this Court in the present revision petition.
10. Accordingly, the criminal revision being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Abhishek