

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

**Civil Review No.174 of 2010
Arising out of
Miscellaneous Appeal No. 735 of 2009**

=====

Renu Devi, wife of Sri Kamlesh Sharma, resident of Village - Dadopur, P.S. & P.O. Bikram, Presently Residing At Mohallah - Mithapur Patna, P.S. - Jakkanpur, District – Patna(Bihar).

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Kamles Sharma, son of Rajdeo Sharma, resident of Village - Raghunathpur, P.S. Paliganj, District - Patna, Presently Residing At Awadhpur Colony, P.S. - Digha, District – Patna.

.. ... Petitioner-Appellant-Opposite Party 1st Set.

2. Krishna Deo Sharma, son of Sri Tribhuwan Sharma, Resident of Mohallah- Mithapur Patna, P.S. Jakkanpur, District – Patna.

.... Opposite Party-Respondent – Respondent 2nd Set.

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent/s :

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

And

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA

ORAL JUDGMENT

(Per: HONOURABLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE)

Date: 16-12-2016

Re.: Interlocutory Application No.5930 of 2010

The application is for condonation of delay of 142 days in filing of the present Civil Review Petition.

For the reasons mentioned in the application, we find that sufficient cause is made out for condonation of delay. Consequently, we condone the delay in filing of the present Civil Review Petition.

Interlocutory Application stands allowed accordingly.

Re.: Civil Review No.174 of 2010

The present petition is for review of the order passed by



this Court on 12th January, 2010 in M.A. No.735 of 2009 whereby, the husband's appeal was allowed and the divorce was ordered to be granted on payment of permanent alimony of Rs.2,50,000/-.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the alimony amount is meager keeping in view the income of the husband, therefore, it is a case of error apparent on record which warrants review of the order.

We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and find no error apparent on record. The argument of learned counsel for the petitioner in appeal was that she should be given permanent alimony of Rs.5,00,000/-, but the Bench fixed permanent alimony at Rs.2,50,000/. Since it is a considered decision of this Court, it cannot be said to be a case of any error apparent on record. The remedy, if any, of the petitioner is not before this Court, but lies elsewhere.

We do not find any reason to entertain the present application for review of the order. Dismissed.

(Hemant Gupta, ACJ)

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

Sunil

AFR/NAFR	N. A. F. R
CAV DATE	N. A.
Uploading Date	19.12.2016
Transmission Date	

