

GAHC010009552018



2026:GAU-AS:4544

THE GAUHATI HIGH COURT
(HIGH COURT OF ASSAM, NAGALAND, MIZORAM AND ARUNACHAL PRADESH)

Case No. : Crl.Rev.P./19/2018

JOGMOHAN BASUMATARY
S/O. LATE GAJEN BASUMATARY, RESIDENT OF KHARATAL PARA,
DUDHNOI, P.O. AND P.S. DUDHNOI, DISTRICT- GOALPARA, ASSAM, PIN-
783124

VERSUS

SAILA BALA RABHA
W/O. LATE GAJEN BASUMATARY, RESIDENT OF KHARATAL PARA,
DUDHNOI, P.O. AND P.S. DUDHNOI, DISTRICT- GOALPARA, ASSAM, PIN-
783124

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. S K SINGHA, MR. B KUMAR, MR. M K NEOG

Advocate for the Respondent : MR D K BORDOLOI,

BEFORE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV KUMAR SHARMA
ORDER

30.03.2026

Mr. D K Bordoloi, learned counsel for the respondent is present while none appeared for the petitioner on call.

2. This Revision has been filed by the petitioner challenging an Order dated 07.11.2017, passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Misc. Case No. 645/2016.

3. By the aforesaid order, the monthly maintenance granted to the respondent at the of Rs. 800/- per month has been enhanced to 4,000/- per month.

4. On perusal of the impugned order it appears that the petitioner is a retired headmaster and he was drawing Rs. 21,000/- per month as pension in the year 2017.

5. In the proceedings before the learned Court below the present petitioner could not produce any material in support of his claim that the respondent wife is a working woman and therefore, she is not entitled to enhancement of the monthly maintenance. It may be stated that in the year 2014 the respondent wife was granted maintenance of Rs. 600/- which will subsequently increased in the year 2016 to Rs. 800/- and by the impugned order for the year 2017, it has been enhanced to Rs. 4,000/- per month.

6. Having regard to the aforesaid facts as reflected above, I do not find

any infirmity, legality or impropriety in the impugned order.

7. The instant petition is found to be devoid of merit and is dismissed accordingly.

8. Interim order if any stands vacated.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant