

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR

MONDAY, THE 31ST DAY OF AUGUST 2015/9TH BHADRA, 1937

RPFC.No. 250 of 2011 ( )

-----

AGAINST THE ORDER IN MC 130/2011 of FAMILY COURT, KOZHIKODE  
DATED 17-09-2011

REVISION PETITIONER/RESPONDENT :

-----

BINOY K.T, S/O.N.R.NAMBIAR, AGED 32 YEARS,  
II C, CHOICE TOWER, MANORAMA JUNCTION  
ERNAKULAM 682 016,  
NOW RESIDING AT 6 A,  
SWAPNIL APARTMENTS, KALOOR-KADAVANTHRA ROAD  
KADAVANTHRA, ERNAKULAM 682 016

BY ADVS.SRI.ALAN PAPALI  
SRI.SOJAN MICHEAL  
SRI.GILBERT GEORGE CORREYA  
SRI.A.VELAPPAN NAIR

RESPONDENTS/STATE AND PETITIONERS:

-----

1. STATE OF KERALA  
REPRESENTED BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR  
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM 682 031
2. ASWATHIRAJ, D/O.GOVINDARAJ,  
AGED 27 YEARS, SREEGOVINDAM, P.O.PANTHEERAMKAVU  
PANTHEERAMKAVU AMSOM, OLAVANNA DESOM, KOZHIKODE TALUK  
PIN 673 019
3. GOURI BINOY, D/O.BINOY K.T,  
MINOR AGED 11 MONTHS, REPRESENTED BY MOTHER  
ASWATHIRAJ, D/O.GOVINDARAJ, SREEGOVINDAM  
P.O.PANTHEERAMKAVU, PANTHEERAMKAVU AMSOM  
OLAVANNA DESOM, KOZHIKODE TALUK PIN 673 019

R2-R3 BY ADVS. SRI.V.V.SURENDRAN  
SRI.P.A.HARISH  
R 1 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SRI.JUSTIN JACOB

THIS REV.PETITION(FAMILY COURT) HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD  
ON 31-08-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

**B. SUDHEENDRA KUMAR, J.**

-----  
**R.P.(FC) No. 250 of 2011**  
-----

Dated this the 31<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2015

**ORDER**

The revision petitioner is the sole respondent in MC 130/2011 on the files of the Family Court, Kozhikode, who in this revision petition challenges the order passed by the court below under Section 125 Cr.P.C, directing the petitioner to pay an amount of Rs.2,000/- to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent herein and an amount of Rs.1,000/- to the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent herein towards monthly maintenance.

2. When this matter has been taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the matter has been settled between the parties and hence, the petitioner is not pressing for hearing this petition on merits. Suffice it to say that I have gone through the order impugned and I am satisfied that the order impugned does not suffer from any illegality, impropriety or incorrectness. After considering the

relevant inputs, the court below had correctly directed the revision petitioner to make payment of maintenance as stated above. Since there is no illegality, impropriety, or incorrectness in the order impugned, I do not find any reason to interfere with the same.

In the result, this Revision Petition stands dismissed.

Sd/-

**B. SUDHEENDRA KUMAR**  
**JUDGE**

sm