

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRR(F)-353-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : 09.11.2017**

Arvind Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

Sandhya Sharma @ Manisha

...Respondent

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Y.S. Turka, Advocate for the petitioner.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

The instant criminal revision petition has been filed against judgment/order dated 05.04.2017, passed by learned District Judge, Family Court, Ambala, in the petition filed by the respondent-wife under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

The sole argument raised by learned counsel for the petitioner is that the Court at Ambala had no jurisdiction to entertain the petition. It is contended that the marriage between the parties was solemnized at Village Bakharpur Balaini, District Bhagpat, Uttar Pradesh on 12.12.2009. The parties last resided at Village Bakharpur Balaini. Even now, the wife is residing there.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the case file.

The relationship between the parties is not in dispute. The petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. was filed supported by a affidavit

of the respondent-wife stating that at the relevant time she had been staying at Ambala. Moreover, there is nothing on record to suggest that the ground of maintainability was taken by the petitioner at the initial stage. Even otherwise, the instant petition suffers from delay of 5 days, which has not been sufficiently explained. No other point is raised.

In view of the above, no ground for interference in the impugned judgment is made out.

Dismissed on the ground of delay as well as on merits.

09.11.2017

atulsethi

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes No

Whether Reportable : Yes No