

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Revision No.99 of 2014

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- MUZAFFARPUR

Daya Shankar Sah, S/o Rajendra Sah, Resident of Village- Rahasi, P.O.- Balthi Rusulpur,
P.S.- Bochaha, District- Muzaffarpur

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Rajendra Sah, S/o Janak Sah, Resident of Village- Rahasi, P.O.- Balthi Rusulpur, P.S.-
Bochaha, District- Muzaffarpur

.... Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Mani Bhushan Kumar, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party : Mr. Arun Kumar, Advocate.
For the State : Mr. Rajendra Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.N. SINHA

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 09-06-2015

Heard learned counsel for the
petitioner and the State.

2. Petitioner son by filing the present
Cr. Revision Application has assailed order dated
13.09.2013 passed by Principal Judge, Family
Court, Muzaffarpur in Maintenance Case No. 58 of
2008, whereunder he was directed to pay a sum of
Rs. 3,000/- per month to his father as
maintenance with effect from 05.07.2008.
Aforesaid order has been passed in the light of the
evidence adduced by the applicant father. From
the impugned order it appears that none appeared
on behalf of the son opposite party to cross-



examine the witnesses adduced on behalf of the father. In the light of the findings recorded by the learned Family Judge in the impugned order, I am not inclined to interfere with the operative portion of the impugned order. In this connection, I may notice the conduct of the son. He has chosen not even to pay the reduced maintenance amount in the light of the interim order of this Court dated 16.10.2014 passed in Cr. Revision No. 29 of 2014. He only appears to be interested in litigating on the plea that father is sympathetic towards his other brother to whom he has given the entire property. Such contention was never raised in the court below.

3. In the circumstances, I am not inclined to consider the same. The Cr. Revision Application is dismissed with cost of Rs. 50,000/- which should be realized from the petitioner by resorting to coercive measures in accordance with law.

(V.N. Sinha, J)

P.K.P.

U		T	
---	--	---	--