



2026:CGHC:12631



2026:CGHC:12631

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 1221 of 2025

Smt. Priyanka Kurrey W/o Jaiprakash Kurrey Aged About 27 Years R/o Village Tingipur, At Present R/o Limbhatha, P.S. And Tahsil Baloda, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

... Applicant

versus

Jaiprakash Kurrey S/o Satyanarayan Kurrey Aged About 26 Years R/o Village Tingipur Ward No. 11, Chowki Pantora, P.S. And Tahsil Baloda, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

... Respondent

(Cause-title is taken from CIS)

For Applicant	:	Ms. Kavita Tiwari, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Not noticed

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal
Order on Board

17/03/2026

1. The present revision under Sections 438, 442 of the BNSS has been preferred by the applicant/wife against the impugned order dated 29.07.2025 passed by the Learned 2nd Additional Session Judge, Janjgir (C.G.).
2. Vide order dated 10.09.2024, passed by learned JMFC Akaltara, District Janjgir-Champa, while allowing the application filed on behalf of the applicant/wife under Sections 19 and 20 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, has directed Respondent/husband to pay a sum of ₹4,000/- monthly towards



maintenance and to make arrangements for accommodation.

2026:CGHC:12631

3. Being aggrieved by the said order, respondent/husband had filed an appeal i.e. Criminal Appeal No.111/2024 before the learned 2nd Additional Sessions Judge, Janjgir and vide impugned order dated 29.07.2025, the appeal was partly allowed and the maintenance amount of ₹4,000/-, awarded by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Akaltara, is partially accepted, modifying the ₹4,000/- maintenance award to be adjusted against the ₹6,000/- monthly interim maintenance ordered by the Principal Judge, Family Court on 07.11.2023 in Case No.113/2023. The JMFC, Akaltara, was also directed to effectuate this adjustment.
4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that impugned order passed by learned 2nd Additional Sessions Judge, Janjgir is erroneous and contrary to the law. Hence, it is prayed that the revision may be allowed and the impugned order may be set-aside.
5. I have heard learned Counsel appearing for the Applicant and perused the documents annexed with the revision including the impugned order.
6. As the order to pay ₹6,000 monthly by the respondent/husband as interim maintenance was already passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court on 07.11.2023 in Case No.113/2023, I find no perversity, illegality, or inconsistency in the findings of the 2nd Additional Sessions Judge, Janjgir, regarding the adjustment of the maintenance amount.
7. Accordingly, the revision is hereby **dismissed** at motion stage itself.

Sd/-

(Sanjay Kumar Jaiswal)
Judge