

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.1370 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.- Year-1111 Thana- District-

=====

Mohammad Shamim Ansari @ Samim Ansari S/o Daroga Mian R/o
Village- Maulanapur, P.S.- Siwan Muffasil, District- Siwan.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar
2. Haseera Khatoon, W/o Md. Shamim Ansari @ Samim Ansari, R/o
Village- Maulanapur, P.S.- Siwan Muffasil, District Siwan, At present
R/o Parasurampur, P.S.- Manjhagarh, District- Gopalganj.

... .. Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr.Satyendra Rai
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Md. Anzarul Haque Sahara

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

5 17-02-2020 Only on a vague assertion in the petition that the petitioner is unemployed, he is seeking interference with the order dated 31.07.2018 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Gopalganj by which learned Principal Judge has awarded a sum of Rs. 2000/- per month to each of the two sons of this petitioner towards their maintenance from the month of July 2011.

The findings of the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Gopalganj is that the petitioner has solemnized a second marriage and he works as a Technician. In the petition filed before this Court there is no denial that the petitioner is not having skill of a technician and if he has not denied this fact, a vague assertion that he is unemployed would not impress this



court to take a different view from that of the view taken by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Gopalganj. The amount awarded to the minor sons are paltry amount of Rs. 2000/- per month only and the court has been informed that the petitioner has not paid any money to them so far. This conduct of the petitioner further satisfy this court that the petitioner has neglected his minor children and in such circumstance this Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits at this stage that both the sons have become major, in the opinion of this court their attaining majority at this stage would be totally immaterial for the purpose of considering the legality and validity of the impugned judgment.

It is not in dispute that they have been awarded maintenance when they were still minor and required to be maintained by their father.

This Application has no merit. It is dismissed accordingly.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

Rajeev/-

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

