



2026:CGHC:2993



2026:CGHC:2993

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRR No. 99 of 2026

Jaleshwar Shrivass @ Gopu S/o Bahal Shrivass Aged About 30 Years R/o Kailash Nagar, Near Apurna Mandir, Kawardha, District - Kabirdham (C.G.)

... **Applicant**

versus

Smt. Bharti Shrivass @ Asha W/o Jaleshwar Shrivass Aged About 27 Years D/o Late Krishna Kumar Shrivass, R/o Lormi Bandha, Police Station - Takhatpur, District - Bilaspur (C.G.)

---- **Respondent**

For Applicant	:	Mr. Kanhaiya Ram Yadav, Advocate.
---------------	---	-----------------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

19.01.2026

1. Heard Mr. Kanhaiya Ram Yadav, learned counsel for the applicant.
2. This Criminal Revision is being aggrieved of the judgment dated 27.11.2025 passed by the learned Family Court, Bilaspur, District – Bilaspur (C.G.) in Misc. Cr. Case No. 113/2024, whereby the learned Family Court, partly allowed the application under Section 125 of the CrPC filed by the respondent, and ordered the applicant/husband that he has to pay the allowance for maintenance at the rate of Rs. 3,000/- per month to the respondent.
3. The facts, in brief, is that the respondent preferred an application under section 125 of the CrPC against the applicant for grant of maintenance and claimed that her marriage with the present applicant



was solemnized according to Hindu rites and customs on 13.05.2022.

After the marriage, following the bidai (farewell ceremony), she went to the applicant's house in the village, and the applicant and respondent began living a marital life. There is no child born from the conjugal relationship between the applicant and the respondent. The respondent remained fine for about one and a half months after the marriage. Thereafter, all the marital items and stridhan were also given from the respondent's parental side. However, despite this, the applicant's family members i.e. mother-in-law, father-in-law, elder sister-in-law (devarani/jethani) and sister-in-law (nanad), started harassing the respondent for dowry, saying that she had brought less items in dowry, that she had not brought a motorcycle in dowry, and taunting her by calling her from a poor family. In this act, the applicant also, influenced by his family members, used to abuse and beat the respondent and mentally and physically harass her.

4. The respondent further alleged that her parental family took her back home. Exactly 15 days later, the applicant did not come respectfully to take his wife/the respondent back, then her father, brother and brother-in-law, through a social panchayat and persuasion, left the respondent at her in-laws' house. When the applicant's family did not send her back to the in-laws, on 27.04.2023, a complaint of dowry harassment was lodged at Police Station Junapara Takhatpur against the applicant and his family members. The respondent is less educated and is a housewife with no source of income. She is completely dependent on her parents and is somehow managing her maintenance with great difficulty. The applicant himself owns a salon shop from which he earns



an income of Rs. 20,000/- per month, and there is ancestral property in the name of his parents. Thus, the applicant is a person with means. Therefore, the respondent be granted Rs. 10,000/- per month as maintenance allowance from the applicant.

5. 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. 3,000/- per month to the respondent. 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.
6. 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/wife has left the house of the applicant and living separately from him without any sufficient reason, therefore, as per provision contained under Section 125(4) of CrPC, she is not entitled to get maintenance from the applicant. Therefore, the impugned order is bad in law, perverse and erroneous, and the same it is liable to be set-aside/quashed.
7. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant, perused the pleadings and documents appended thereto.



8. 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.
9. Accordingly, the criminal revision being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**.
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

Rajshekhar