



2026:AHC:51036

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

CRIMINAL REVISION No. - 1108 of 2026

Ajay Verman

.....Revisionist(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Revisionist(s) : Arvind Kumar Srivastava, Virendra Singh
Counsel for Opposite Party(s) : G.A.

Court No. - 88

HON'BLE VINOD DIWAKAR, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the revisionist and perused the material available on record.
2. The present criminal revision has been preferred against the impugned order dated 20.12.2025 passed by the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, District Etawah in Case No. 374 of 2020 (Smt. Priti Verman and another v. Ajay Verman), under Section 127 Cr.P.C., Police Station Kotwali, District Etawah, whereby the learned Family Court has enhanced the maintenance payable by the revisionist, increasing the amount from Rs. 3,500/- to Rs. 8,000/- per month in favour of the wife and from Rs. 1,500/- to Rs. 4,000/- per month in favour of the minor son.
3. Learned counsel for the revisionist submits that the revisionist is employed as a *Keyman* in the Railways and is earning approximately Rs. 55,000/- per month. It is contended that the order passed by the learned Family Court enhancing the maintenance amount is erroneous, arbitrary and excessive, inasmuch as the financial capacity of the revisionist has not been properly appreciated. It is further submitted that the revisionist is a Group-D employee in the Railway Department and his income is limited. Apart from meeting his own day-to-day expenses, the revisionist is also under a legal and moral obligation to maintain his aged parents. It is further urged that the revisionist is also required to extend financial support to his unmarried brother and sisters, which imposes additional financial burden upon him.
4. Learned counsel further submits that the learned Family Court, while

passing the impugned order, has failed to adequately consider the liabilities and financial constraints of the revisionist and has enhanced the maintenance amount without properly assessing the balance between the income of the revisionist and his existing responsibilities. It is thus contended that the enhancement of maintenance is disproportionate and beyond the paying capacity of the revisionist and, therefore, the impugned order is liable to be set aside or suitably modified by this Court in exercise of its revisional jurisdiction.

5. This Court has considered the submissions advanced by learned counsel for the revisionist and has perused the impugned order as well as the material available on record. From a perusal of the impugned order, it transpires that the learned Family Court has taken into consideration the relevant factors, including the income of the revisionist, the status of the parties, and the requirement of the respondent while determining and enhancing the amount of maintenance.

6. It is well settled that the object of granting maintenance is to prevent the wife from falling into destitution and vagrancy and to ensure that she is able to maintain herself with dignity in a manner commensurate with the status and financial capacity of the husband. The provisions relating to maintenance are social welfare measures intended to provide financial support to a wife who is unable to maintain herself.

7. In the present case, the learned Family Court appears to have exercised its discretion judiciously while determining the enhanced amount of maintenance. The income of the revisionist, as stated to be approximately Rs. 55,000/- per month, cannot be said to be so meagre as to render him incapable of complying with the order passed by the learned Family Court. Merely because the revisionist has certain familial obligations would not absolve him of his primary responsibility to maintain his legally wedded wife.

8. The revisional jurisdiction of this Court is limited in scope and is ordinarily exercised only where there is manifest illegality, perversity, or material irregularity in the order impugned. In the present case, no such infirmity is apparent from the impugned order so as to warrant interference by this Court.

9. In view of the foregoing discussion, this Court does not find any illegality,

impropriety, or material irregularity in the order passed by the learned Family Court.

10. The present revision is devoid of merit and is, accordingly, dismissed.

March 12, 2026
Anil K. Sharma

(Vinod Diwakar,J.)