

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CIVIL MISCELLANEOUS JURISDICTION No.156 of 2017**

=====

Sri Motilal Sinha Kanan

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

Shalini Kumari

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Uday Kumar

For the Respondent/s : Mr.

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MUNGESHWAR
SAHOO**

ORAL ORDER

2 30-01-2017 The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that if he will be granted two weeks time, he will complete his evidence without taking any adjournments in the case.

From perusal of the order dated 20.12.2016 passed by Principal Judge, Family Court, Vaishali in Maintenance Case No.155 of 2015, it appears that the court below has closed the evidence of the present petitioner considering the fact that the petitioner himself has already been examined as witness in the case and on this ground also, the court below has rejected the recall application.

Thus, I find that when the court below has passed a reasoned order considering the case of the petitioner, only on the ground that if two weeks time is granted the petitioner he will complete his evidence, the impugned order cannot be interfered



with in exercise of supervisory jurisdiction.

Thus, I find no reason to interfere with the impugned order in exercise of supervisory jurisdiction and accordingly, this civil miscellaneous application is dismissed.

(Mungeshwar Sahoo, J)

Saurabh/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

