

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Revision No.611 of 2016

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year- Thana- District-

=====

Hafiz Imam Akhtar @ Md. Imam Akhtar son of Matin, resident of village-
Tajkhand, P.S.- Ajam Nagar, District - Katihar.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar and Ors
2. Sanjeeda Begum wife of Hafiz Imam Akhtar @ Md. Imam Akhtar daughter of Late Naimuddin.
3. Md. Saklain son of Hafiz Imam Akhtar @ Md. Imam Akhtar under the guardianship of his mother Sanjeeda Begum, Both resident of village- Jaljala, P.S. Ajam Nagar, District Katihar.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bimal Kumar
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Sri Yogendra Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

5 24-01-2019 This revision application has been filed against the order dated 22.03.2016 passed by Shri Ramesh Chandra Malviya, learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Katihar in Maintenance Case No. 10 of 2013, whereby and whereunder, he has allowed the maintenance petition and directed the petitioner to pay Rs. 2,000/- per month to opposite party no. 2 and Rs. 1,000/- per month to opposite party no. 3.

It appears that opposite party nos. 2 and 3 filed maintenance case in the court of learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Katihar for grant of maintenance of Rs. 4,000/- to opposite party no. 2 and Rs. 2,000/- to opposite party no. 3. Learned Additional Principal Judge, Katihar after adducing the evidence as well as after hearing the parties, has allowed the maintenance case



filed by the opposite party nos 2 and 3 and directed the petitioner to pay Rs. 2,000/- per month to opposite party no. 2 and Rs. 1,000/- per month to opposite party no. 3.

Being aggrieved, the petitioner has preferred the instant revision application. However, he has confined his submission to the effect that he is ready for one time settlement if the opposite party no. 2 agrees and earlier the mediation was going on in another proceeding. It has also been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that he is ready to pay the maintenance amount to opposite party nos. 2 and 3, as per the direction of learned Family Court, Katihar.

Learned counsel for opposite parties has no instruction as to whether the opposite parties are ready for one time settlement or not.

Considering the aforesaid aspects of the matter, this revision application is dismissed and impugned order is affirmed with an observation that if in future, both the parties agree for one time settlement, they may approach the family Court Katihar for the same and if any such petition is filed, the Family Court, Katihar shall pass an appropriate order in accordance with law, without being prejudiced by the order of this Court.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunilkumar/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

