



2026:CGHC:2991



2026:CGHC:2991

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 109 of 2026

1 - Arti Singh W/o Atul Kumar Singh Aged About 32 Years R/o House No. E/124, Shristi Samridhi Colony, P S Bodri Chakarbhatta, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Ku. Aviyana Singh D/o Atul Kumar Singh Aged About 5 Years Minor Under The Natural Guardianship Of Mother Arti Singh, W/o Atul Kumar Singh, R/o House No. E/124, Shristi Samridhi Colony, P S Bodri Chakarbhatta, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

... Applicants

versus

Atul Kumar Singh S/o Rajendra Bahadur Singh Aged About 39 Years R/o Village Jhotiya P S Janahi Tahsil Tyothar, District Rewa, M.P., Presently Residing At Village Morga, Prathmika Swasthya Kendra Morga, Korba, District : Korba, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Applicants	: Mr. Hariom Rai, Advocate.
----------------	-----------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

19.01.2026

1. Heard Mr. Hariom Rai, learned counsel appearing for the applicants.
2. This Criminal Revision is being aggrieved of the impugned order dated 27.11.2025 passed by the learned Family Court, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) in MJC No. 412/2025, whereby the learned Family Court has partly allowed the application for grant of interim maintenance, and directed the respondent to pay Rs. 5,000/- per month to the applicant No.2 as the interim maintenance.
3. The prosecution story in brief is that the applicant No. 01 and respondent are wife and Husband, and from their wedlock one



daughter was born who is applicant No.2. The applicants filed an application for grant of maintenance as well as grant of interim maintenance against the present respondent that the applicants were not able to maintain herself and her daughter, thereafter both the applicants were dependent upon the maternal family. As per the applicant No. 01 the respondent is working as the Government R.M.A. (Rural medical assistant) and earning a smart amount of Rs. 1,00,000/- per month (income included with allowances), and the applicants demand for Rs. 40,000/- per month for final maintenance and also till the pendency of the maintenance application under appropriate provision of BNSS interim maintenance.

4. The respondent herein has filed the reply to the said interim maintenance application and has denied the averments raised by the applicant. The learned Family Court by passing the impugned order, has partly allowed the application for grant of interim maintenance, and directed the respondent to pay Rs. 5,000/- per month to the applicant No.2 as the interim maintenance. Hence, this revision.
5. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant submits that the learned Family Court has denied the maintenance in favor of wife/applicant No.1, that the respondent has purchased one home in which he is paying the installment of loan of Rs. 15,000/- per month and also paying the monthly fees of school of applicant No.2, but the learned Family Court has failed to appreciate that for the livelihood of any person, house is not only element for survival, other element for example food, clothing medical transport etc. are also necessary for basic survival of any person, therefore, the impugned order is bad in



law, perverse, arbitrary, erroneous, and the same is liable to be modified.

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 orders of the trial Court, it transpires that no any good ground has been raised on merits by the applicants' side, thus, the interim maintenance of Rs. 5,000/- which has been ordered to be paid to the applicant No.2 by respondent cannot be said to be meager amount and it is clear that after considering all the materials and after applying mind the learned Family Court concerned has passed the impugned order and partly allowed the application for grant of interim maintenance, and there is no illegality and infirmity while passing the same.
8. Accordingly, the prayer made to quash the impugned order is refused.
9. However, the present revision is **disposed of** with the direction that the concerned Family Court is at liberty to conclude the proceedings under Section 144 of BNSS, preferably within a period of three months from today, if there is no any legal impediment.
10. 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