

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL REVISION No.937 of 2018

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

=====

Ramesh Paswan Son of Late Parmeshwar Paswan, resident of Village-
Manjhaulia, Police Station- Sakra, District- Muzaffarpur. Petitioner
Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Shobha Devi, Wife of Ramesh Paswan,
3. Guriya Kumari, Daughter of Ramesh Paswan, Mother Shobha Devi, Both
resident of Village- Manjhaulia, P.S.- Sakra, District- Muzaffarpur.
... .. Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Rajiv Ranjan, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP
For the O.P. Nos. 2, 3	:	Mr. Hans Lal Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

5 26-07-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the opposite party nos. 2 and 3.

The petitioner in the present case is aggrieved by and dissatisfied with the order dated 16.03.2018 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Muzaffarpur in Maintenance Case No. 204 of 2013 by which the learned court below has directed the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs. 4,000/- per month to O.P. No. 2 and Rs. 2,500/- per month to O.P. No. 3 from the date of filing of the petition i.e. 22.08.2013.

It appears on perusal of the impugned order that this petitioner who was opposite party in the learned court below appeared before the court and filed a written statement in which he made allegation of illicit relationship against his wife but in course of evidence, he did not cross-examine the applicant and her witnesses



who had supported her case on the point that she had been ousted from her matrimonial house with her minor daughter on 06.07.2011 and since then she had been neglected by her husband-petitioner.

The opposite party-husband filed his affidavited evidence but did not come forward for his cross-examination. The learned court below has found that there are evidences on the record showing that the opposite party-husband is a skilled *karigar* working in Delhi and is doing a tailoring job in a sports company. In fact, this assertion of the applicant has not been denied by the opposite party-husband. Learned counsel for the petitioner admits that the petitioner works as a tailor though in a vague manner, it has been submitted that he was not working during the lockdown period but has not denied that he is an employee in a company doing tailoring job.

In the given facts and circumstances, in view of the materials on the record and the conduct of the petitioner showing that he has not cooperated in the learned court below at any stage of the procedure, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the impugned judgment.

This revision application is, thus, dismissed.

Let the impugned order be enforced by the learned court below.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

SUSHMA2/-

U			
---	--	--	--

Note: The ordersheet duly signed has been attached with the record. However, in view of the present arrangements, during Pandemic period all concerned shall act on the basis of the copy of the order uploaded on the High Court website under the heading 'Judicial Orders Passed During The Pandemic Period'.

