

GAHC010178792025



2026:GAU-AS:3981

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

Case No. : CRP(IO)/333/2025

PHANIRAM URAO
S/O SRI PHULEN URAO, R/O VILL- PURADIA, P.O.- BALLAMGURI, P.S.-
BIJNI, DIST- CHIRANG, BTR, ASSAM

VERSUS

SMT. BAPPI BACKLA
D/O FICHU BACKLA, R/O KHUNKRAJHORA, P.O.- KHUNKRAJHORA, P.S.-
AMGURI, DIST- CHIRANG, BTR, ASSAM

Advocate for the Petitioner : MR. A K GUPTA, MR H J TAMULI

Advocate for the Respondent : MR. U B SARMA, S DEY, MRS. G SARMA

B E F O R E
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KAUSHIK GOSWAMI

ORDER

18.03.2026

Heard Mr. AK Gupta, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner. Also heard Mr. UB Sarma, the learned counsel for the respondent.

2. By way of the present petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner has assailed the order dated 23.06.2025 passed by the learned Additional District Judge, Bijni in Misc. Case No. 05/2025 arising out of Title Suit (D) Case No. 24/2024, whereby the learned Court granted maintenance *pendente lite* to the respondent-wife at the rate of Rs.7,500/- per month, payable by the petitioner-husband.

3. Mr. A.K. Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the respondent is admittedly residing in Delhi and is engaged as a household maid. It is, therefore, contended that the learned trial Court ought not to have saddled the petitioner with the liability of paying maintenance.

4. *Per contra*, Mr. U.B. Sarma, learned counsel for the respondent-wife, submits that the learned trial Court, upon due appreciation of the materials on record and particularly considering the income of the petitioner, assessed at approximately Rs. 50,000/- per month, vis-à-vis the respondent, who is dependent upon her parents and has no stable or sufficient independent income apart from working as a household maid, rightly fixed the monthly maintenance at Rs. 7,500/-.

5. Having heard the learned counsels for the parties and upon perusal of the materials available on record, this Court finds that the present petition does not disclose any jurisdictional error. Rather, it seeks re-appreciation of evidence, which is impermissible within the limited supervisory jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution.

6. It is a well-settled principle that the jurisdiction under Article 227 is supervisory in nature and does not vest this Court with the powers of an appellate forum. Interference is warranted only in cases of patent perversity or

manifest illegality. In the present case, no such infirmity is discernible in the impugned order. The grant of maintenance *pendente lite* at Rs. 7,500/- per month, having regard to the respective financial positions of the parties, cannot be said to suffer from any perversity or jurisdictional error warranting interference.

7. Accordingly, the present revision petition stands dismissed. No order as to costs.

JUDGE

Comparing Assistant