

**In Re: Bharata Iyer**

**In Re: Bharata Iyer**

**SooperKanoon Citation :** [sooperkanoon.com/794553](http://sooperkanoon.com/794553)

**Court :** Chennai

**Decided On :** Dec-13-1923

**Reported in :** (1924)46MLJ324

**Appellant :** In Re: Bharata Iyer

**Judgement :**

**Odgers, J.**

1. This is an application to revise the order of the Sub-Divisional Magistrate of Malapuram made under Section 488, Cr. P. Code wherein he ordered the petitioner to pay a monthly allowance of Rs. 4 for the maintenance of the child of the respondent, a Nair woman, the petitioner being a Brahmin. The petitioner denied the sammandam and disowned the paternity of the child. The learned Magistrate however observed that his vakil did not press this point seriously either in the cross-examination of the prosecution witnesses or in his own defence, and has come to the finding that the paternity of the child is proved. The main point relied upon before the lower court was that the woman was in a position to maintain the child and therefore the father was not liable to maintain it. Mr. N. R. Sesha Iyer before me has taken the same point and relies on two decisions of this Court, namely, Chantan v. Mathu ILR (1919) M 957 and Parrappath Chinna v. Sankuni Menon : (1919)37MLJ361 . In the former case it was held that a child that possesses a right to maintenance from its mother's tavazhi is not entitled to an order for maintenance against its father. It was also held that the words ' unable to

maintain ' are not confined to physical inability but include also pecuniary inability. Abdur Rahim, J., in that case said: 'I think the ability contemplated by the section applies as much to the case of a child which has got means of its own or which is entitled in law to be maintained, and is being maintained as in this case by some other person as to a child which is able to earn a living by its own exertions.' In the later case in Parrappath Chinna v. Sankunni Menon : (1919)37MLJ361 to which Ayling, J., was also a party as in the earlier case which was followed, the learned Judges say that the offspring of a sammandham are entitled to maintenance from their tavazhi, and if the tavazhi or tarwad has sufficient means to maintain them, they are not entitled to an order for maintenance against their father. And the reason which prompted the learned Judges there to revise the order of the Magistrate was that the lower Court had not found what the income of the tavazhi was, nor had it given any findings as to the income of the tarwad. In this case the learned Magistrate has found as a fact that the respondent's tarwad is not in a position to maintain the child without an allowance from the petitioner. Sitting here in revision I am bound by that finding of fact. I must therefore dismiss this Criminal Revision Case.

**SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - [sooperkanoon.com](http://sooperkanoon.com)**