

**THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE P.KESHA RAO**

**CRIMINAL REVISION CASE No.1471 OF 2018**

**ORDER:**

This Criminal Revision Case is filed against the orders dated 17.05.2018 in CrI.M.P.No.37 of 2017 in CrI. Revision No.24 of 2017 on the file of Court of IX Additional Sessions Judge at Kamareddy directing the petitioner herein to pay half of the maintenance amount granted in M.C.No.5 of 2010 by the Judicial First Class Magistrate, Yellareddy, Nizamabad District, dated 30.06.2017.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and perused the material on record.

The facts of the case are that the first respondent-wife filed M.C.No.5 of 2010 against the revision petitioner-husband on the file of the Judicial First Class Magistrate, Yellareddy claiming a sum of Rs.6,000/- per month towards maintenance. After full-fledged trial, the said M.C. was allowed by order dated 30.06.2017 directing the petitioner herein to pay maintenance at the rate of Rs.6,000/- per month to the first respondent herein commencing from the date of filing of the petition. Aggrieved by the said orders, the petitioner herein filed CrI.Revision No.24 of 2017 on the file of IX Additional Sessions Judge at Kamareddy. Pending the said revision, CrI.M.P.No.37 of 2017 is filed to stay the further proceedings in M.C.No.5 of 2010. The revisional Court, after hearing the parties and on perusal of the record, by the impugned order allowed the said CrI.M.P. and granted stay on condition of petitioner depositing half of the maintenance amount granted in

M.C.No.5 of 2010. Aggrieved by the said condition, the present revision is filed.

The counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that though the trial Court passed an order directing the petitioner to pay the maintenance from the date of filing of the petition, no specific reasons are given and therefore, the impugned order cannot be maintained. Though the revisional Court has granted stay, this aspect of the matter is not considered. Therefore, he sought the indulgence of this Court.

A perusal of the material on record reveals that the order passed by the revisional Court is only an interim measure pending disposal of the main Criminal Revision. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order passed by the revisional Court. However, the counsel for the petitioner seeks time to comply with the impugned order dated 17.05.2018.

Keeping the said submissions into consideration and having regard to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds no merits in the Criminal Revision Case and accordingly, the same is dismissed. However, the petitioner is granted two months' time from today to comply with the impugned orders dated 17.05.2018. The learned IX Additional Sessions Judge at Kamareddy is directed to dispose of the main revision within a period of four months from today.

Pending miscellaneous petitions, if any, shall also stand closed.

**P.KESHAHA RAO,J**

15<sup>th</sup> JUNE 2018.  
Tsr