



2026:CGHC:4115

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRR No. 1054 of 2023**

Ved Kumar Manhare S/o Shri Ramdas Manhare Aged About 33 Years
 Permanent Address Village Patharpuji, Makan No. 45/1 Beechpara, Tahsil
 Berla, District- Bemetara, (C.G.) Present Address Electrical Sub Station
 Mungeli, Post Operator, Tahsil Mungeli, District- Mungeli, Chhattisgarh.

... Applicant**versus**

1 - Smt. Anjali Manhare W/o Shri Ved Kumar Manhare Aged About 32 Years
 R/o Village Kohka, Post Kohka Bhilai, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.

2 - Minor Gritvik S/o Ved Kumar Manhare, Aged About 01 Year 10 Month,
 Through Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Anjali Manhare, R/o Village Kohka,
 Post Kohka Bhilai, Tahsil And District- Durg, Chhattisgarh.

---- RespondentRAJSHEKHAR
SONIDigitally signed
by
RAJSHEKHAR
SONI

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. T.R. Patel, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Vikas Kumar Pandey, learned counsel for the applicant.
2. This Criminal Revision is being aggrieved of the judgment dated 26.07.2023 passed by the learned Family Court, Durg, District – Durg (C.G.) in Misc. Cr. Case No. 94/2021, whereby the learned Family Court, partly allowed the application under Section 125 of the CrPC filed by the respondents, and ordered the applicant that he has to pay the allowance for maintenance at the rate of Rs. 3,500/- per month to the respondent No.2.

3. The facts, in brief, is that an application under Section 125 of CrPC was filed by the respondents for grant of maintenance from the applicant. The marriage of the applicant along with the respondent No.1 was solemnized on 17.04.20216 as per Hindu Rites and Customs at place Bhilai, District – Durg (C.G.) and the respondent No.2 are born out of that 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 13.03.2019 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 Rs. 3,500/- per month to the respondent No.2. 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 No.1 is a contractual teacher, and she has a source of income, and without any sufficient reason she has left the house of the applicant. 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 which requires 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

Rajshekhar