

223

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of Decision : 30.11.2015

1) C.R.M-18285-2014 in/and C.R.R-117(F)-2014

Rajpal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Kiran Bala and another

..... Respondents

2) C.R.R-133(F)-2015(O&M)

Rajpal

..... Petitioner

Versus

Kiran Bala and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. Ankit Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P.S. Jammu, Advocate
for the respondents.

1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

AJAY TEWARI, J. (Oral)

CRM-18285-2014

For the reasons recorded, the application is allowed subject to
all just exceptions. Delay of 158 days in filing the revision bearing

CRR-117(F)-2014 is condoned.

CRR-117(F)-2014 & CRR-133-2015(O&M)

Since the facts are common both the revisions are decided by the common order.

By these revisions the petitioner has challenged the order of maintenance awarded to the respondents.

On 29.06.2015 the following order was passed in CRR(F)-133-2015:-

“Case taken up today as per order passed in Crl. Revision(F) No.117 of 2014.

Mr. Surender Saini, Advocate, who is present in the other petition accepts notice in this petition as well.

The petitioner is ready to make part payment and submits that he is not in a position to pay the entire amount in one go.

The matter is already fixed for 23.07.2015. On that date, the petitioner shall pay an amount of Rs.60,000/- by way of bank draft in the name of his wife Kiran Bala whereafter the request of the petitioner for paying the remaining amount in installments will be considered.

The petitioner is stated to be in civil imprisonment on account of order dated 3.6.2015. It is, therefore, ordered that the petitioner shall be released on payment of Rs.60,000/- to respondent-Kiran Bala, if it be before 23.7.2015 and that release shall be temporary subject to the final outcome of the application for stay moved by the petitioner.

Adjourned to 23.7.2015.

Copy of the order be given dasti under the signatures of the Special Secretary of this Bench.”

Thereafter on 09.10.2015 the following order was passed in CRR(F)-133-2015:-

“Counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner will pay the entire amount of arrears upto date within a period of one month.

Adjourned to 6.11.2015.”

On 06.11.2015 the petitioner sought an adjournment. Today the learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is not in a position to pay the amount and urges that the case be heard on merits.

In my opinion, a perusal of the original order shows that the petitioner has tried to over-reach this Court and has obtained the order of bail by representing that he is willing to pay the entire amount.

In the circumstances, the prayer to now decide the case on merits is rejected.

Petitions are dismissed.

Since the main cases have been decided, the pending Criminal Misc. Application, if any, also stands disposed of.

November 30, 2015
ashish

(AJAY TEWARI)
JUDGE