

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

CRR No.4811 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: October 23, 2018

Deepak Sharma

...Petitioner

Versus

Neetu Sharma

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present:- None for the petitioner.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant criminal revision has been filed against the impugned order dated 31.05.2016 whereby, the petitioner herein had been directed to pay ₹ 7000/- per month to the respondent as interim relief. The appeal against the said order stood dismissed on 04.11.2016 by the lower Appellate Court.

On 23.12.2016, learned counsel for the petitioner prayed for stay of conditional warrant of arrest on the ground that he would pay ₹ 50,000/- within a month and the balance amount would be paid within a period of two months thereafter. An amount of ₹ 20,000/- was deposited within time, however, more time was sought to pay the balance amount of ₹ 30,000/-. The request for extension of time was allowed, failing which it was made clear that the interim protection granted to the petitioner would stand vacated. The said order was not complied with, but the matter was

adjourned, keeping in view the interest of all parties concerned. On 05.09.2017, a sum of ₹ 25,000/- was paid by way of demand draft to the counsel for the respondent-wife and the matter was adjourned for arguments. The matter was taken up on 16.12.2017, on which date there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner and the matter was listed onwards, but could not be taken up for want of court time.

Today, the case is taken up for hearing in its normal turn. There is no one to represent the petitioner. It is noted that the petitioner had submitted that he would pay a sum of ₹ 50,000/- within a month and the balance amount would be paid within a period of two months thereafter. A perusal of the interim orders reflect that a sum of ₹ 20,000/- and ₹ 25,000/- has been paid to the respondent-wife, which is short of the amount payable by the petitioner. Since, there is a shortfall and non-compliance of the orders passed on 23.12.2016 and 19.07.2017, this court is not inclined to entertain the said petition.

Dismissed.

However, before parting with this, liberty is given to the petitioner to have the petition revived in case, he can satisfy this court that there is compliance of the orders, so passed.

October 23, 2018

vijay saini

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No