

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Revision No.765 of 2025

Ashish Kr. Ranjan @ Ashish Kumar Ranjan @ Ashish Ranjan, aged about 41 years, Son of Late Bindeshwari Prasad Singh, Resident of Bari Cooperative Colony, Plot No. 130, Sita Niwas, P.O. & P.S.-Sector-12, Dist.-Bokaro (Jharkhand) ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Sneha, aged about 36 years, Wife of Ashish Kr. Ranjan @ Ashish Kumar Ranjan, Resident of Karmik Nagar (Moti Nagar), P.O.-I.S.M., P.S.-Saraidhela, District- Dhanbad ... Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Alok Kumar Dubey, Advocate.
For the State : Ms. Sushma Aind, APP

3/15.09.2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

2. This Criminal Revision petition has been preferred against the Judgment dated 23.06.2025 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Dhanbad in Original Maintenance Case No. 365/2023, in the application filed under Section 125 of Cr.P.C., directed the petitioner to pay Rs. 15,000/- per month to O.P. No. 2 as maintenance allowances from the date of filing of the application and further directed to pay arrears of the maintenance amount within 6 months.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the O.P. No.2 is the legally wedded wife and the marriage was solemnized on 01.07.2021 as per the Hindu Customs and Rites. He submits that the allegations are made that at the time of marriage, cash amount, jewelry and other articles had been gifted to the petitioner. He further submits O.P. No.2 has left the matrimonial home since 30.06.2022. He further submits that the case has also been registered under Section

498A of IPC against the petitioner and others. He further submits that the learned Court has wrongly appreciated the income of the petitioner and directed to pay a sum of Rs.15,000/-, which is not in accordance with law. On these grounds, he submits that the impugned order may kindly be set-aside.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that the learned court has rightly passed the impugned order and directed to pay a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month, which is meager amount in the present scenario. She submits that there is no illegality in the impugned order.

5. In view of the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, the Court has gone to the impugned order and found that the learned Court has discussed the materials available on record. The learned Court has discussed the statement of the opposite parity No.2 as she has submitted that the petitioner herein is having an income of Rs.1,25,000/- per month from all sources. The learned Court has found that the petitioner herein has not been able to produce any document to suggest that the wife is earning and the wife has also not been able to produce any document to suggest the proper income of the petitioner. All these aspects have been considered by the learned Court; however, the learned Court has relied on the admission made by the petitioner and the petitioner has admitted that the monthly salary of the petitioner is Rs. 54,000/- per month. Learned Court has accepted that statement and thereafter has passed the impugned order for payment of Rs.15,000/- per month to be paid by the petitioner to

the opposite party No.2 wife. The petitioner being the husband bound to maintain the wife and the learned Court has relied upon the statement of the petitioner and the salary pointed out by him, has been accepted by the learned Court. The learned Court has considered several Judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court on the issue in questions and thereafter passed the impugned order. This Court finds that there is no illegality in the impugned order.

6. As such, this revision petition is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

R.Kumar