



NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**REVP No. 15 of 2026**

1 - Sarika Agrawal W/o Arpit Kumar Agrawal Aged About 34 Years
Currently R/o C/o Basant Kumar Agrawal, Near To Gopidas Temple,
Purani Basti (Baniyapara) Raipur, District- Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

... Petitioner(s)
(Respondent)

versus

1 - Arpit Kumar Agrawal S/o Sushil Kumar Agrawal Aged About 35
Years Permanent R/o Baigapara, Near To Dinesh Electrical, Durg,
Chhattisgarh, Currently R/o Flat No. 711, Kundala City, Agrasen Chowk,
Ambikapur, District- Surguja (Ambikapur), Chhattisgarh.

... Respondent
(Appellant)

(Cause-title taken from the Case Information System)

For Petitioner :- Mr. Sachin Nidhi, Advocate

For Respondent :- None.

Division Bench:- Hon'ble Smt. Justice Rajani Dubey & Hon'ble Shri
Justice Amitendra Kishore Prasad

Order On Board

18.02.2026

Per, Amitendra Kishore Prasad, J.

1. Heard.
2. The present Review Petition is filed being aggrieved by the order



dated 14.11.2025 (Annexure P/1) passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court in First Appeal (MAT) No. 18 of 2024.

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition seeking review of the order dated 14.11.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Hon'ble Court in First Appeal (MAT) No.18 of 2024, whereby the Hon'ble Court has allowed the appeal filed by the respondent husband and has directed the respondent husband to pay permanent alimony of Rs.20,00,000/- to the petitioner wife. The petitioner herein seeking the enhancement of the permanent alimony to Rs.50,00,000 by considering the important factors which needs to considered at the time of deciding the amount of permanent alimony.

4. Following prayer has been made in this petition:-

"It is, therefore, prayed that this Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to allow this petition and may kindly be pleased to hear the matter afresh and review and modify its previous order dated 14.11.2025 passed in First Appeal (MAT) No.18 of 2024, and direct the respondent husband to pay the permanent alimony of Rs.50,00,000 to the petitioner wife, in the interest of justice."

5. Facts of the case are that the First Appeal (MAT) No. 18 of 2024 was preferred by the appellant/husband under Section 19(1) of the Family Courts Act, 1984 challenging the judgment and decree dated 13.12.2023 passed by the learned First Additional Chief Judge, Family Court, Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.) in Civil Case No. HMA/732/2019. By the said judgment, the application filed by the appellant/husband



under Section 13(1)(i-a) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 seeking dissolution of marriage was dismissed. This Hon'ble Court, while partly allowing the appeal, vide order dated 14.11.2025, directed the appellant/husband to pay a sum of ₹20,00,000/- as permanent alimony to the respondent/wife. The petitioner respectfully submits that while passing the said direction, this Hon'ble Court did not consider the settled and mandatory factors required for determination of permanent alimony. The income and financial capacity of the husband, the status and standard of living of the parties, and the reasonable needs of the wife were not duly examined. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has laid down comprehensive guidelines for fixation of permanent alimony. The non-consideration of the said factors has resulted in an inadequate and unjust determination of permanent alimony. Hence, the present Review Petition has been filed.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the impugned judgment dated 14.11.2025 fixing permanent alimony at ₹20,00,000/- suffers from an apparent error on the face of the record, as the Hon'ble Court did not take into consideration the settled and mandatory factors governing determination of permanent alimony. It is submitted that the respondent-husband is drawing a monthly gross salary of ₹1,64,517.31/-, which fact stands admitted on record and is supported by the salary slip annexed as Annexure P/2, yet the same was not considered. Learned counsel further submits that the petitioner-wife has no independent source of income and has remained unemployed since 2014 due to prolonged litigation and her responsibility of taking care of



her aged parents, namely her father aged about 75 years and mother aged about 69 years, and the entire family is dependent upon the meagre old-age pension of the father. It is further submitted that a substantial amount of ₹35,00,000/- to ₹40,00,000/- was spent for matrimonial purposes at the time of marriage in the year 2009, and the petitioner-wife is entitled to live a life commensurate with the standard of living of the respondent-husband, whose income is on the higher side. Learned counsel also submits that the respondent-husband suppressed material facts relating to ancestral properties while filing the affidavit of disclosure, which were subsequently brought on record. In view of the long duration of marriage, prolonged separation since 2014, and the settled law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, the learned counsel prays that the impugned judgment be reviewed and the permanent alimony be enhanced from ₹20,00,000/- to ₹50,00,000/- in the interest of justice.

7. None appears for the respondent.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the material available on record.

9. In the review petition, various grounds have been raised assailing correctness of the finding recorded by this Court. The grounds do not make out any case for review and the review petition appears to be more in nature of an appeal in disguise.

10. It is well settled that scope of review jurisdiction is extremely limited and only an error apparent on face of record can be corrected in



the said jurisdiction and re-appraisal/re-appreciation cannot be done in exercise of said jurisdiction as that would amount to exercise of appellate jurisdiction which is impermissible in law as has been held in catena of judgments by the Hon'ble Apex Court, such as ***Devaraju Pillai v. Sellayya Pillai***, reported in ***(1987) 1 SCC 61***, ***Meera Bhanja (Smt) v. Nirmala Kumari Choudhury (Smt)***, reported in ***(1995) 1 SCC 170***, ***Avijit Tea Co. Pvt. Ltd. v. Terai Tea Co. and others***, reported in ***(1996) 10 SCC 174***, ***Lily Thomas etc. v. Union of India and others***, reported in ***AIR 2000 SC 1650***, ***Akhilesh Yadav v. Vishwanath Chaturvedi and others***, reported in ***(2013) 2 SCC 1*** and ***Sasi (D) through LRS. v. Aravindakshan Nair and others***, reported in ***(2017) 4 SCC 692***).

11. The grounds raised by the review petitioner in this review petition cannot be permitted to be raised in review petition. Even otherwise, there is no error apparent on the face of record in the order under review warranting invocation of review jurisdiction.

12. Accordingly, the review petition is **dismissed**.

13. No order as to cost(s).

Sd/-
(Rajani Dubey)
Judge

Sd/-
(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge