

**Crl.M.P.No.8037 of 2022 in Crl.R.C.No.689 of 2021****D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.**

The main Revision Case was filed by the petitioner, being aggrieved by the order of the V Additional Family Court, Chennai, dated 19.04.2021 in M.C.No.14 of 2019, thereby, directing the respondent to pay a sum of Rs.20,000/- per month as maintenance. The said Revision Case came up for hearing on 04.03.2022 and since there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner, this Court had dismissed the Revision Case for default. Thereafter, an application is filed to restore the Criminal Revision Case along with another petition to condone the delay of 15 days in filing the petition to restore the Criminal Revision Case.

2. Today, when the condone delay petition came up for hearing, again there is no representation for the petitioner. Therefore, inspite of dismissing again the petition to condone the delay in filing the restoration petition for default, even in the absence of the learned Counsel for the petitioner, this Court took up the application.

3. On a perusal of the application, the petitioner has stated that only because of the default of his then Counsel on record, he could not appear in the Revision. But, however, no details have been given as to on what date, it came to his knowledge about the dismissal of the Revision and in what manner. The reason given that only after engaging the present Counsel, he came to know, is vague and unacceptable.



WEB COPY



2

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

grs

4. Therefore, the petition, to condone the delay in restoring the Revision Case, is dismissed.

06.07.2022

grs

Crl.M.P.No.8037 of 2022
in Crl.R.C.No.689 of 2021