



(1)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.84 OF 2018

Ramchandra s/o Shankarrao Jadhav

....APPLICANT

VERSUS

1. Indumati w/ Ramchandra Jadhav
2. Akshay s/o Ramchandra Jadhav
3. Pratiksha d/o Ramchandra Jadhav

....RESPONDENTS

.....

Mr Chaitanya C. Deshpande, Advocate for Applicant
Mr Ameya N. Sabnis, Advocate for Respondents

.....

CORAM : SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.

DATE : 03 SEPTEMBER 2026

P. C. :

1. The applicant/husband is challenging the orders dated 16/12/2017 and 21/02/2018, passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Latur in Petition E.R. No.44/2017. Vide order dated 16/12/2017, the learned Family Court observed that as the warrant for recovery of amount of Rs.1,04,100/- was returned un-executed, for recovery of due amount, there is no alternative except to sentence the applicant for simple imprisonment for one month or till the period, he does not make payment of entire due amount. Vide order dated 21/02/2018, the learned Judge of the Family Court observed that, if the

(2)

the applicant deposits entire due amount stated in conviction warrant i.e. Rs.1,04,100/-, he shall be released, otherwise, he be sent to jail with a conviction warrant. On the same date, the applicant came to be sent to jail under the warrant. Therefore, he has approached this Court challenging the aforesaid orders in the instant revision application.

2. This Court, vide order dated 19th March 2018, suspended the execution of the impugned orders dated 16/12/2017 and 21/02/2018, on furnishing a P.R. bond of ₹15,000 with one surety, on the condition that within two weeks after applicant's release, he shall deposit a sum of Rs.50,000/- before the Family Court. Thereafter, this matter was listed on 20/06/2018, wherein the Advocate for the applicant sought time to produce the receipt in respect of the amount deposited by the applicant before the Family Court. On 17/07/2018, the learned Advocate for the applicant made a statement that the applicant had deposited Rs.50,000 in the Family Court, however, he sought time to produce the receipt. On 07/08/2018, the office remark shows that the applicant produced the receipt of Rs.50,000/- deposited before the Family Court.

3. This matter was listed again on 21st August 2026, wherein this Court observed that the applicant was not in touch with his and

(3)

the Advocate for the applicant sought time by way of a last chance till today.

4. The applicant, who was working as a teacher under the Municipal Council, Latur was directed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Latur to pay maintenance of Rs.500/- p.m. to the wife and Rs.300/- p.m. each to son and daughter. In the year 2008, the respondents filed proceedings under Section 127 of the Cr.P.C. for an enhancement in the maintenance amount. On 27/01/2012, the said application came to be allowed with effect from 09/01/2008, and as per the enhanced amount, the applicant came to be directed to pay RS.800/- p.m. to the wife and Rs.700/- p.m. each to both the children.

5. It is the case of the applicant that respondent No.3/daughter Pratiksha got married and the age of the son is also 26 years of age. Thus, both the children have attained majority. Still, the application came to be filed by respondent No.1(wife) showing them as minors. The said application was filed for the recovery of an amount of Rs.56,900/-

6. On 27/03/2017, Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 457/2012 came to be transferred to the Principal Family Court, Latur, and renumbered as Petition E.R. No. 44 of 2017. The learned Family

(4)

Court, on 16/12/2017, passed the order and issued a warrant of recovery for the amount of ₹1,04,100. The learned Family Court, on 21/02/2018, passed the order that only on depositing ₹1,04,100, the applicant be released, otherwise, he be sent to jail with a conviction warrant.

7. The record discloses that the applicant, after his release, deposited the amount of Rs.50,000/- before the Family Court. As regards the remaining amount, there is no submission from the learned Advocates for the parties. However, it appears that till date, since nobody is coming forward with specific instructions from the parties, the matter does not require any specific order by this Court.

8. As the instant criminal revision application was filed in the year 2018, and there is also a reference in the application that the children have attained majority and the daughter is married, in such an eventuality, it is not desirable to pass any further order in this matter.

9. Therefore, the instant matter is being disposed of with no order as to costs. However, since there is no assistance from the applicant to his learned Advocate, in the event, the grievance persists and a cause of action survives, the parties will be at liberty to approach this Court again.

(5)

10. With above observations, this criminal revision application is disposed of.

[SUSHIL M. GHODESWAR, J.]

sjk