



2026:CGHC:7373

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRR No. 1441 of 2024**

Balram More S/o Babudas More Aged About 50 Years Occupation
Government Service Additional Chief Executive Officer Zila Panchayat
Kondagaon District - Kondagaon (C.G.) Permanent R/o Behind Rajesh
Steel Krishna Nagar Santoshi Nagar Raipur District - Raipur (C.G.)
(Non Applicant

... Applicant(s)**versus**

1 - Smt. Satrupa More W/o Balram More Aged About 29 Years R/o Atal
Awasthi Ghugharikala Police Station And Tahsil - Kawardha District -
Kabirdham (C.G.) (Applicants)

2 - Ku. Amrita More D/o Balram More Aged About 5 Years Through
Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Satrupa More W/o Shri Balram More R/o
Atal Awasthi Ghugharikala Police Station And Tahsil - Kawardha District -
Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Respondent(s)

For Applicant(s) : Mr. Ali Afzaal Mirza, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Chandrikaditya Pandey, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Order on Board

10/02/2026

1. The applicant has filed this criminal revision against the order dated 13.11.2024 passed by learned Family Court, Kabirdham (Kawardha) (C.G.) in Misc. Criminal Case No.52/2023, whereby, the learned Family Court partly allowed the application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. filed by the respondents and directed the applicant to pay Rs.10,000/- per month to respondent No.1 and Rs.10,000/- per month to respondent No.2, towards maintenance.
2. Brief facts necessary for disposal of this revision are that during the period 2014–15, the applicant, while posted as Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Kawardha, came into contact with respondent No.1, who was working as a Data Entry Operator in Gram Panchayat Paneka. The applicant represented himself as an unmarried person, developed a love relationship with respondent No.1 and, after proposing marriage, solemnized marriage with her on 21.07.2016 according to Hindu rites and customs. Thereafter, the parties lived together at different places owing to the applicant's transfers, and out of the said relationship, a daughter, respondent No.2, was born on 15.02.2018. Subsequently, respondent No.1 came to know that the applicant was already a married person and had concealed his prior marriage. Upon complaint, a compromise dated 07.04.2021 was executed, whereby the applicant agreed to pay Rs.15,000/- per

month towards maintenance, which he deposited for some time in the bank account of respondent No.1 but later discontinued from November 2021. Since then, the respondents have been living without any source of income and are unable to maintain themselves. The applicant, being an able-bodied person and holding a senior government post with substantial income, denied the relationship and paternity of respondent No.2 and refused maintenance. Considering the pleadings and evidence, the learned Family Court, by order dated 13.11.2024, partly allowed the application and directed the applicant to pay maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month each to respondent No.1 and respondent No.2 from the date of application i.e. 15.05.2023, against which the present petition has been filed.

- 3.** Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the impugned order dated 13.11.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Kabirdham (Kawardha) (C.G.) in M.C.C. No. 52/2023 is illegal, perverse and unsustainable in law, as the learned Court has erred both on facts and law while granting maintenance to the respondents. The findings recorded by the learned Family Court are based on conjectures and surmises and are contrary to the evidence available on record. He further submits that the learned Family Court has wrongly concluded that a valid marriage was solemnized between the petitioner and respondent No.1, solely relying upon the oral testimony of respondent No.1, without any cogent or independent evidence proving marriage as per the

provisions of the Hindu Marriage Act. The photographs (Articles A-1 to A-36) relied upon by the Court were neither duly proved in accordance with the Indian Evidence Act nor supported by negatives or a certificate under Section 65-B, despite specific objection by the petitioner that the photographs were edited and morphed. He also submits that the learned Family Court further failed to appreciate that the alleged agreement (Exhibit-P/37) was not proved in accordance with law, as neither the scribe nor any attesting witness was examined. The respondent No.1 also failed to establish her legal status as wife or the paternity of respondent No.2. In spite of these serious infirmities and contradictions in evidence, the learned Family Court erroneously granted maintenance to the respondents, warranting interference by this Hon'ble Court.

4. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent opposes the submissions made by the learned counsel for the applicant and submits that the Family Court after considering all the documents and evidence adduced by the parties has passed the order, in which no interference is called for.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the impugned order and other documents appended with criminal revision.
6. From perusal of the impugned order, it transpires that the learned Family Court partly allowed the application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. filed by the respondents and directed the applicant to pay

Rs.10,000/- per month to respondent No.1 and Rs.10,000/- per month to respondent No.2, towards maintenance, holding that the marriage between the applicant and respondent No.1 stood proved on the basis of oral and documentary evidence, they had cohabited as husband and wife at different places for a considerable period, that respondent No.2 was born out of their relationship, and that the applicant, being a person having sufficient means, had neglected and refused to maintain the respondents, thereby entitling them to receive maintenance under Section 125 Cr.P.C.

7. Considering the submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the parties and perusing the impugned order and the finding recorded by the learned Family Court, I am of the view that the Family Court has not committed any illegality or infirmity or jurisdictional error in the impugned order warranting interference by this Court.
8. Accordingly, the revision being devoid of merit is liable to be and is hereby **dismissed**.
9. Registrar (Judicial) is directed to transmit the original record to the concerned Family Court within a week from today for necessary information and follow up action.

Sd/-

(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice