

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA**Cr.Rev.(FC) No.78 of 2025****Date of decision: 24.09.2026**

Major Vikrant Verma**.....Petitioner****Versus****Shallu Verma and another****.....Respondents**

Coram**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge.****The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Yogesh Jaswal, Judge.*****Whether approved for reporting?¹*****For the Petitioner : Mr.Munish Datwalia, Advocate.****For the Respondents : Mr. Ashok Kumar Verma, Advocate.**

Ajay Mohan Goel, Judge (Oral)

By way this petition, the petitioner has laid challenge to the order dated 25.02.2025, passed by the Court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Shimla, in Case No. 43/2022, titled Master Roybenson Verma and another versus Major Vikrant Verma in terms whereof, the application preferred by the respondents herein was disposed of by the learned Court below in the following terms:-

“21. In view of my findings on point Nos. 1 to 6 above, the petitioner partly succeeds. The respondent is already directed by the Hon'ble High Court of H.P. vide order dated 03.07.2024 to pay ₹30,000/- to petitioner No.2 and ₹20,000/- to petitioner No.1 per month. In addition, the respondent shall also pay the expenses for education of the child, in my

¹***Whether the reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the Judgment?Yes***

considered view, in the facts and circumstances of the case, no further amount, is required to be awarded in the present proceedings. Hence, petition is partly allowed in the above terms. File after due completion be consigned to record room."

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the impugned order was passed by the learned Court below on the basis of order dated 03.07.2024 passed by this Court in FAO (FC) No. 09/2023. He submitted that thereafter, a review was sought of the said order and subsequently, the order dated 03.07.2024 was reviewed and in terms of the subsequent order passed by the High Court in FAO (FC) No. 09/2023, dated 27.05.2025, the wife has been held entitled to an amount of ₹30,000 per month, and the child has been held entitled to an amount of ₹3,000 per month. Accordingly, he submitted that in light of this development as the order passed by the learned Court below is bad in law, the same be set -aside.

3. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having perused the impugned order, we are of the considered view that as the order which was passed by the learned Court below was correctly passed at the relevant time, in light of the contents of the order of this Court dated 03.07.2024 in FAO (FC) No. 09/2023, if on account of subsequent developments, if any, modification in the said order is required, then, the petitioner has to approach the learned

Court below itself. The filing of this petition in the backdrop of the facts enunciated in the Revision Petition is not justified.

4. Faced with this situation, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that these proceedings be closed, but with liberty to the petitioner to file appropriate proceedings before the learned Court. Proceedings are closed, with liberty as prayed for, subject to all just exceptions.

(Ajay Mohan Goel)
Judge

(Yogesh Jaswal)
Judge

24th September, 2026.
(yogesh)