

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI  
Cr. Revision No.179 of 2020**

Abhijit Dutta ..... **Petitioner**

**Versus**

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Payal Dutta  
@ Payal Mitra Neogi ..... **Opp. Parties**

-----

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR**

-----

For the Petitioner : Mr. L. C. N. Shahdeo, Advocate  
Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate  
For the State : Mr. Someshwar Rai, A.P.P  
For the O.P. No.02 : Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate

-----

The matter was taken up through Video Conferencing. Learned counsel for the parties had no objection with it and submitted that the audio and video qualities are good.

-----

**06/Dated: 08<sup>th</sup> September, 2021**

1. Defects, as pointed out by the office, are ignored for the time being.
2. The present revision application has been filed against the order dated 13.12.2019, passed by the court of learned Additional Principal Judge, Additional Family Court, Jamshedpur in O.M. (Misc.) Case No.12 of 2018, whereby the maintenance amount of Rs.20,000/- (Twenty thousand) per month has been awarded in favour of the wife/ O.P. No.02 from the date of the institution of the case.
3. It has been submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is working in abroad, i.e., in China and he has some personal expenses to meet out. He has also the liability to take care of his aged parents. Showing the aforesaid liabilities, it has been submitted by the learned counsel that the maintenance amount of Rs.20,000/- per month is excessive and it should be reduced to Rs.10,000/- (Ten thousand) per month.
4. On the other hand, learned A.P.P, assisted by the learned counsel for O.P. No.02, has opposed and submitted that the maintenance amount awarded by the Family Court is rational and it should not be interfered with by this Court in revisional jurisdiction.

5. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P and learned counsel for the O.P. No.02. The other parameters of the impugned judgment are not in dispute, only quantum of maintenance has been disputed and so as the liability. The income of Rs.88,000/- (eighty eight thousand) per month of the revisionist has also not been disputed. There are four family members in the family of the revisionist - (1) the father, (2) the mother, (3) the revisionist himself and (4) the wife/ O.P. No.02. Thus, Rs.20,000/- for each member is otherwise also sufficient. One fourth amount to the wife is rational and it cannot be said to be irrational in any view of the matter.

6. In view of the aforesaid discussion, I do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order accordingly, the criminal revision application is, hereby, rejected.

**(Rajesh Kumar, J.)**

**Chandan/-**