



2026:CGHC:3961

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 679 of 2023

Smt. Leena Netam W/o Akhilesh Netam Aged About 31 Years
Occupation Housewife, Present R/o Mongragahan, Police Station-
Arjuni Tahsil And District- Dhamtari Chhattisgarh

... Applicant(s)

versus

Akhilesh Netam S/o Gendlal Netam Aged About 36 Years Occupation
Manager, Union Bank, R/o 32/62, Ward No. 57, Katulbod, Hari Nagar,
Durg Tahsil And District Durg Chhattisgarh

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s) : Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Patel, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Vivek Mishra, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

22/01/2026

1. The applicant has filed this criminal revision against the order dated 12.04.2023 passed by learned Judge, Family Court, Dhamtari, District – Dhamtari (C.G.) in Misc. Criminal Case No.45/2020, whereby the learned Family Court has partly allowed

the application under Section 125 CrPC filed by the applicant and directed the respondent to pay Rs.6,000/- per month to applicant towards maintenance.

2. Brief facts necessary for disposal of this revision are that the applicant filed an application under Section 125 of Cr.P.C. seeking maintenance of Rs. 20,000/- per month from the respondent on the ground that they are legally married since 16.06.2014 as per social rituals at Village Mongragahan, District Dhamtari (C.G.), and after marriage she was subjected to cruelty and physical assault on account of dowry demand, including non-consummation of marriage, and has no independent source of income, whereas the respondent is working as a Branch Manager in Union Bank and earning about Rs. 70,000/- to 80,000/- per month; the respondent denied the allegations and claimed that the applicant herself earns Rs. 60,000/- per month; upon consideration of evidence, the learned Family Court by order dated 12.04.2023 partly allowed the application and awarded maintenance of Rs. 6,000/- per month, being dissatisfied with which the applicant has preferred the present criminal revision seeking enhancement of the maintenance amount.
3. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the impugned order passed by the learned Family Court is contrary to the facts and evidence available on record, as the learned Court has failed to properly appreciate the material placed before it. The grant of maintenance amount of Rs. 6,000/- per month is on the lower side

and does not commensurate with the income and status of the respondent, who is holding the post of Branch Manager and earning about Rs. 60,000/- per month. He further submits that considering the entire facts, circumstances, and evidence on record, the maintenance amount awarded to the petitioner deserves to be enhanced.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent opposes the submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant and submits that the Family Court after considering all the documents and evidence adduced by the parties has passed the order, in which no interference is called for.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the impugned order and other documents appended with criminal revision.
6. From perusal of the impugned order, it transpires that the learned Family Court has partly allowed the application under Section 125 CrPC filed by the applicant and directed the respondent to pay Rs.6,000/- per month to applicant towards maintenance observing that the applicant is the legally wedded wife of the respondent, has sufficient and reasonable cause to live separately on account of mental cruelty due to denial of marital relations, and is unable to maintain herself, whereas the respondent is gainfully employed as a Branch Manager in Union Bank earning about Rs. 60,000/- per month, however, after considering the overall facts, evidence on record, the needs of the applicant, and the alleged financial

liabilities of the respondent, the learned Family Court assessed the maintenance amount at Rs. 6,000/- per month as just and proper.

7. Considering the submissions 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 Family Court has not committed any illegality or infirmity or jurisdictional error in the impugned order warranting interference by this Court.
8. Accordingly, the revision being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**.
9. Registrar (Judicial) is directed to transmit the original record to the concerned Family Court within a week from today for necessary information and follow up action.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice

Akhil