

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

Crl. Revision(F)-74-2018

Date of Decision: 20.3.2018

Naveen Thakran

.....Petitioner

Versus

Kavita Thakran

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr. Suresh Kumar Kaushik, Advocate
for the petitioner.

ANITA CHAUDHRY, J

The petitioner has assailed the order dated 24.11.2017 passed by the Family Court, Bhiwani.

I have heard the counsel for the petitioner.

Counsel for the petitioner contends that the impugned order was passed without taking into consideration the real facts and the petitioner was junior to a Lawyer who died sometime in August 2017 and the petitioner has no source of income and he is not in a position to pay the maintenance and the petitioner was suffering from depression. The counsel refers to Annexures P-6 and P-7.

On perusal of the record it is found that the parties had been referred for mediation but compromise could not be effected. The petitioner got his statement recorded that he was ready to pay Rs. 5,000/- per month as interim maintenance to the wife from the date of the application. It is on the basis of the statement made by the petitioner that the Court directed the

consent order. The petitioner wants to wriggle out of the statement. The order was passed on the concession given by the petitioner himself, he cannot be permitted to turn around and challenge it.

The petition is dismissed in *limine*.

(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE

March 20, 2018
Gurpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No