

SL. No.	Date	Office Notes, reports, orders or proceedings or directions and Registrar's order with Signatures	COURT'S OR JUDGE'S ORDERS
			<u>CRLR/763/2025</u> Deepali Bajwa Gupta --Revisionist Versus State Of Uttarakhand --Respondent <u>Hon'ble Alok Mahra, J.</u> Mr. Devang Dobhal, Advocate for the revisionist. 2. Mr. S.S. Chauhan, D.A.G. alongwith Mr. Vikas Uniyal, Brief Holder for the State. 3. Mr. Sagar Kothari, Advocate for respondent no. 2. 4. This Criminal Revision has been filed by the revisionist challenging the order dated 19.09.2025 passed by the court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Dehradun, whereby, the learned Principal Judge, Family Court directed the revisionist to produce her son alongwith her before the court on the next date fixed in Criminal Case No. 70 of 2023, Deepali Bajwa Gupta and Another Vs. Aneep Gupta, under Section 125 Cr.P.C. 5. Learned counsel for the revisionist submits that this order cannot be sustained as the interim maintenance application of the revisionist filed on 21.02.2023 is still pending and without deciding this application, the Court has directed the revisionist to produce her son

		before the Court. It is further submitted by learned counsel for the revisionist that the matter is pending since the year 2023 and the revisionist was examined-in-chief on 26.04.2025, but, the respondent is avoiding in getting the revisionist examined on one pretext or the other. Thereafter, several opportunities were granted to the respondent to cross-examine and on 26.04.2025, partial cross-examination was conducted and the matter was deferred. On the next date, Presiding Officer was on training. Thereafter, the revisionist herself sought adjournment on the next date. 6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent supplied to the Court the order dated 27.10.2025 passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, in which, it has clearly been mentioned that the revisionist had not pressed her application for interim maintenance and she is absenting herself for cross-examination. As such, cost was also imposed upon the revisionist. The order-sheet is taken on record. 7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record. 8. Perusal of the order-sheet would reveal that on several occasions, the revisionist herself was absenting herself and subsequently the impugned order was passed. Aggrieved by the impugned order, the revisionist also filed a transfer application, which has been dismissed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 04.09.2025 in Criminal Misc. Transfer Application No. 33 of 2025.
--	--	---

			9. Having considered the rival submissions and the material placed on record, this Court is of the view that no jurisdictional error, perversity or material irregularity is made out in the impugned order warranting interference in revisional jurisdiction. Furthermore, it is also true that the scope of criminal revision is very restricted. It is exercised just to examine the correctness, legality or propriety of any finding, sentence or order. Evaluation and appreciation of evidence is not desired unless some admissible evidence is ignored or inadmissible evidence is taken into consideration. The learned court below has exercised its discretion in a judicious manner and the same does not suffer from any illegality or impropriety. 10. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision is devoid of merit and is liable to be dismissed and is hereby dismissed. (Alok Mahra J.) 28.07.2026 Ujjwal
--	--	--	---