

\$~46

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ CRL.REV.P. 174/2016 & CrI.M.A. Nos.3365-66/2016

RAJESH KUMAR Petitioner

Through : Mr. Deepak Saini, Adv.

versus

NIRMALA @ RAJRANI Respondent

Through : None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

% **21.07.2016**

By this revision petition under Section 397 of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973, petitioner has challenged the order dated 23rd March, 2015 whereby interim maintenance of ₹2,000/- has been awarded in favour of the respondent/wife. A perusal of order dated 23rd March, 2015 shows that it is a consent order. Trial Court has categorically mentioned that parties have arrived at a compromise as regards the quantum of interim maintenance without prejudice to their respective stand in the pleadings. As per the order, petitioner/husband had agreed to pay and respondent/wife had agreed to receive a sum of ₹2,000/- per month. Joint statement of the parties was recorded by the Trial Court on the same day before passing this order. Certified copy of this joint statement has already been filed on record. No revision petition can be entertained against the compromise order, which has

been passed after the joint statement of the parties.

Dismissed. Miscellaneous applications are disposed of as infructuous.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

JULY 21, 2016/dk