

Palpandi Vs Kamatchi

Palpandi Vs Kamatchi

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1530552

Court : Chennai Orders

Decided On : Feb-02-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice N.Senthilkumar

Appeal No. : CRP(MD)/231/2026

Appellant : Palpandi

Respondent : Kamatchi

Judgement :

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT Dated :
02.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE N.SENTHILKUMAR and CMP(MD)
No.985 of 2026 Palpandi ... Petitioner Vs 1.Kamatchi 2.Minor.
Logeshwaran ... Respondents PRAYER :-Civil Revision Petition filed
under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, to call for the records
relating to the fair and Decreetal order in I.A.No. 1 of 2025 in HMOP.No.
202 of 2025 on the file of the Family Judge, Dindigul District dated
21.11.2025. For Petitioner : Mr.Shanmuga Sundaram

ORDER

This Civil Revision Petition has been filed challenging the order

made in I.A.No.1 of 2025 in HMOP.No.202 of 2025 on the file of the Family Court, Dindigul, dated 21.11.2025.

2.The petitioner and the first respondent are the husband and wife and the marriage between them was solemnized on 23.01.2019, according to Hindu Rites and Customs. Due to difference of opinion, the petitioner/husband has filed HMOP.No.202 of 2025 against the first respondent/wife before the Family Court at Madurai, seeking divorce. Pending HMOP, the respondents filed I.A.No.1 of 2025 seeking interim alimony and the Court below, vide order, dated 21.11.2025, awarded a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month payable by the petitioner to the respondents towards interim maintenance. Challenging the same, the present Civil Revision Petition has been filed.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is working in a Textile shop and is receiving only a meager salary and is, therefore, unable to pay a sum of Rs.5,000/- per month towards interim maintenance to the respondents. He further submits that the Court below failed to consider that the first respondent is residing separately from the petitioner without any just or reasonable cause, and as such, she is not entitled to claim maintenance from the petitioner. It is

also submitted that the Court below, without properly appreciating the

facts and evidence on record, has awarded interim maintenance of

Rs.5,000/- per month to the respondents, which warrants interference of this Court. Hence, he prays for appropriate orders. 4.I have considered the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner and also perused the record. Since no adverse order is going to be passed against the respondents, notice to the respondents is dispensed with.

5.The learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to point out any such illegality or impropriety or incorrectness in the impugned order, which may persuade this Court to interfere with the same. The amount fixed for maintenance was Rs.5,000/- per month to the respondents, which, in the present days of rising prices and high cost of living, cannot be considered excessive or disproportionate. The provisions of Section 125 of Cr.P.C are beneficial provisions, which are enacted to stop the vagrancy of a destitute wife and provide some

succour to them, who are entitled to get the maintenance, which cannot be denied. The fact that the petitioner is the husband of the first respondent, has not been denied. 6.In such circumstances to meet the ends of justice, the impugned

order does not require any interference. There is no illegality,

impropriety and incorrectness in the impugned order and also there seems to be no abuse of Court's process. 7.In view of the above, this Civil Revision Petition lacks merit and stands dismissed. No costs. Consequently, connected Miscellaneous Petition stands closed. Speaking : Yes / No 02.02.2026 NCC : Yes / No Internet : Yes / No Index : Yes / No mm To The Judge, Family Court, Dindigul District

N.SENTHILKUMAR, J.

mm 02.02.2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com