

HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE A. SHANKAR NARAYANA

CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.608 OF 2005

ORDER:

The present Criminal Revision Case, under Sections 397 and 401 Cr.P.C, is filed by the revision petitioner – respondent assailing the order, dated 15.02.2005, passed in M.C.No.213 of 2004 on the file of learned Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge for Trial of Jubilee Hills Car Bomb Blast Cases – cum – Additional Family Court, Hyderabad, whereby and whereunder, the learned Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge, having evaluated the evidence of PW.1 and RW.1, directed the revision petitioner to pay Rs.1,000/- per month towards maintenance to respondent No.1 from the date of petition till he attains the age of majority.

2. No representation for the revision petitioner.

3. Sri Ali Farooq, learned counsel for respondent No.1, is present and tendered arguments.

4. In fact, the present revision case was listed in advance list and again listed in today's list. Still, there is no representation for the revision petitioner. Therefore, proceeded with disposal of the case on merits.

5. Perused the order under challenge and the material on record.

6. It is clear from the record that the revision petitioner's father worked in Saudi Arabia for two years, but he died about 8 or 9 months prior to filing the M.C. and the revision petitioner also had been to Saudi Arabia in the year 1999, worked as helper under an electrician for 1 ½ years and during that period he earned 600 Riyals per month and sent Rs.3,000/- per month to PW.1 and presently, he is residing in a house at Gunfoundry being the only son of his parents and the said house is having three floors with three rooms in each floor, but he expressed ignorance as to whether his father was owning any house at Masab Tank deriving rent at Rs.12,000/- per month. Certain other facts have been recorded by the learned Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge to the effect that there was an agreement entered into on 18.06.2004. The settlement would reflect that the revision petitioner returned Rs.11,000/- towards Meher amount, Rs.30,000/- towards value of the Scooter, Rs.25,000/- towards Jodeka Rakam and he pronounced divorce to the mother of respondent No.1.

7. Having regard to the facts and circumstances, the amount of Rs.1,000/- per month awarded by the learned Additional Metropolitan Sessions Judge to respondent No.1 towards maintenance, by any standard, cannot be faulted. In fact, it is on lower side even in the year 2005. There is no ground or merit in this revision case to interfere with the order under challenge. The maintenance awarded was also from the date of petition till respondent No.1 attains majority. The M.C. relates to the year 2004 and the age of respondent No.1, at the

time of filing M.C., was shown as five years and by now, he would have ceased to be minor or nearing completion of minority age.

8. Hence, the present Criminal Revision Case is dismissed. Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this Criminal Revision Case shall stand closed.

A. SHANKAR NARAYANA, J

November 09, 2017.
MD

