

mm

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL / CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 192 OF 2015
IN
M.J. PETITION NO.92 OF 2014

Omar Haroon Shaikh ...Applicant/Orig.Respdt.
Vs.
Almas Mehmood Whewaria & Ors. ...Respondents/Orig.Ptnrs.

Mr. Ayaz Khan, Advocate for the Applicant
Mr. Shoaib I. Memon, Advocate for the Respondent No.1

ALONG WITH
FAMILY COURT APPEAL NO.91 OF 2015
IN
FAMILY COURT MAINTENANCE PETITION NO. E-92 OF 2014

Almas Mehmood Whewaria & Anr. ...Appellants/Orig.Ptnrs.
Vs.
Omar Haroon Shaikh ...Respondent/Orig.Rspdt.

ALONG WITH
CONTEMPT PETITION NO. 326 OF 2015
IN
FAMILY COURT APPEAL NO.54 OF 2015
IN
FAMILY COURT CUSTOD PETITION NO. D-66 OF 2012

Omar Haroon Shaikh ...Petitioner/Orig.Respdt.
Vs.
Almas Mehmood Whewaria & Ors. ...Respondents/Orig.Appl

Ms.T.F. Irani i/b. Ayaz Khan, Advocate for the Petitioner in
CP No.326 of 2015 & Respondent in FCA No.54 and FCA No.91/2015
Mr. Shoaib Memon, Advocate for the Respondent in

CP. No. 326 of 2015 & Appellant in FCA No.54 of 2015 and FCA No.91 of 2015

**CORAM : NARESH H. PATIL AND
A.A. SAYED, JJ.**

DATE : 10TH FEBRUARY, 2016.

P.C. :

1] Heard the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner and the respondent. Perused the record. Perused the order passed by this Court on 2nd September, 2015 and 5th October, 2015. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner prayed for grant of interim relief. It is submitted that the trial Court was misled by the respondent by producing lengthy evidence. The trial Court ascertained maintenance amount on a higher side. The Counsel for the petitioner submitted on instructions that the petitioner is willing to pay maintenance to the child. The Counsel objected to grant of maintenance to the respondent, mother of the child. One of the contentions is that the mother of the child is earning and resides with her mother in a three bedroom flat. We have considered the submissions. The learned Counsel appearing for the respondent submits that the respondent had prayed for grant of interim relief, but this Court had rejected the prayer by an order dated 5th October,

2015. The amount of maintenance has been assessed reasonably.

2] In the fact, we are of the view that no interference is called for in the maintenance amount granted by Court. The revision petition is rejected.

(A.A. SAYED, J.)

(NARESH H. PATIL, J.)