



2026:CGHC:4116

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRR No. 874 of 2023**

Parmanand S/o Bhuvanlal Lahre Aged About 40 Years Caste Satnami,
Residence Of Village Khohahal, Thana Urga, District Korba (C.G.)

... Applicant**versus**

1 - Dineshwari W/o Parmanad Aged About 25 Years Residence Of Village
Katghora, Thana Katghora, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba (C.G.)

2 - Minor Ishika D/o Parmanand Aged About 4 Years Through Natural
Guardian Mother Dineshwari, W/o Parmanad, Caste Satnami, Residence Of
Village Katghora, Thana Katghora, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba (C.G.)

3 - Minor Aditya S/o Parmanand Aged About 2 Years Through Natural
Guardian Mother Dineshwari, W/o Parmanad, Caste Satnami, Residence Of
Village Katghora, Thana Katghora, Tahsil Katghora, District Korba (C.G.)

---- Respondents

For Applicant	:	Mr. T.R. Patel, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Vikas Kumar Pandey, Advocate.
---------------	---	--

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****23.01.2026**

1. Heard Mr. Pramod Shrivastava, learned counsel for the applicant.
2. This Criminal Revision is being aggrieved of the judgment dated 29.11.2021 passed by the learned Family Court, Camp Court Katghora, District – Korba (C.G.) in Misc. Cr. Case No. 30/2021, whereby the learned Family Court, partly allowed the application under Section 125 of the CrPC filed by the respondents, and ordered the applicant/husband that he has to pay the allowance for maintenance at the rate of total Rs. 4,000/- per month to the respondents.

RAJSHEKHAR
SONIDigitally signed
by
RAJSHEKHAR
SONI

- 3.** The facts, in brief, is that an application under Section 125 of CrPC before the learned Family Court for grant of maintenance from the applicant. Marriage was solemnized between the applicant and respondent No.1 on 29.04.2015, as per the Hindu Rites and Customs at place Katghora, District – Korba, and the respondent No.2 and 3 are born out of the wedlock. It is alleged that the applicant did not take care of the respondents and also tortured to the applicant, therefore, respondents leave the house of the applicant on 04.05.2020 and resides with her parental home.
- 4.** The applicant has filed the reply and denied the contention of the application filed by the respondents. The learned Family Court after recording the evidence of the parties passed the impugned order, whereby the learned Family Court partly allowed the application of the respondents and directed to the applicant to pay the amount of total Rs. 4,000/- per month to the respondents. The impugned order passed by the learned Family Court is without any appreciation of facts, and material available on record only on the basis of arbitrary manner, thus, the impugned order is completely illegal. Hence, this revision.
- 5.** Learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that impugned order passed by the learned Family Court, is contrary to the facts and evidence available on record. It is further submitted that the respondent is voluntarily residing separately from the applicant with mutual consent, and their divorce has already been executed. Therefore, the impugned order is bad in law, perverse and erroneous, and the same it is liable to be set-aside/quashed.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant, perused the pleadings and documents appended thereto.
7. Considering the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the applicant, and from the perusal of the impugned order passed by the learned Family Court, it transpires that after hearing all the statements of the witnesses and perusing the evidence available on record, the learned Family Court has passed the impugned order, and there is no any illegality and infirmity while passing the same warranting interference by this Court.
8. Accordingly, the criminal revision being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**.
9. Let a certified copy of this order be transmitted to the concerned trial Court for necessary compliance and follow up action, if any.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice