



HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION No. - 1772 of 2026

Sushma Yadav

.....Revisionist(s)

Versus

State of U.P. and Another

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Revisionist(s)	:	Akhilesh Pandey
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	G.A.

Court No. - 87

HON'BLE PRAVEEN KUMAR GIRI, J.

1. Supplementary affidavit filed today is taken on record.
2. Learned counsel for the revisionist submits that he has filed the instant criminal revision with the relief which has been mentioned in the prayer clause of the revision.
3. The relief which has been mentioned in the revision is delineated below:-

"It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed that this Hon'ble Court may graciously be pleased to allow the present revision and quash the order dated 12-02-2026 passed by Additional Principal Judge, Family Court No. 1, Jaunpur in Case no. 1788 of 2023 (Smt. Sushma Yadav and another Vs Deepchand Yadav), under section 125 Cr.P.C., Police Station Saraikhwaja, District Jaunpur, in which dismiss the maintenance case of Revisionist and accept the maintenance case of her son Devansh Yadav and directed the opposite party no. 2 to pay Rs. 3,000/- per month to the son of Revisionist from the application dated 26-07-2023.

It is further prayed that this Hon'ble Court may be pleased to remand back the case and directed the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court No. 1, Jaunpur passed the fresh and appropriate order or modify the order dated 12-02-2026 on the application of applicant."

4. Learned counsel for the revisionist submits that the revisionist has filed

an application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. for maintenance for herself and her minor child and vide order dated 12.02.2026, the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court-I, Jaunpur has granted maintenance only to the minor child to the tune of Rs.3,000/- per month and rejected the maintenance application in respect of the revisionist-wife. He further submits that the husband, opposite party No.2, is earning about Rs.80,000/- per month working in the Railway Department. He also submits that the revisionist-wife wants to live with her husband-opposite party No.2, along with her minor child, as the education of the child is being affected.

5. Learned counsel for the revisionist further submits that the wife is not earning any amount, however, she has been treated as an earning lady and, therefore, her claim for maintenance has been rejected.

6. Matter requires consideration.

7. Issue notice to opposite party No.2 for filing counter affidavit.

8. Counter affidavit shall be filed within four weeks. Rejoinder affidavit may be filed within a week thereafter.

9. List this case as fresh on 18.05.2026.

(Praveen Kumar Giri,J.)

April 10, 2026

K.Tiwari