

**THE HON'BLE Dr. JUSTICE SHAMEEM AKTHER
AND
THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA**

**FAMILY COURT APPEAL No.109 OF 2011
AND
CIVIL REVISION PETITION No.2020 OF 2009**

COMMON JUDGMENT: (Per Hon'ble Dr.SAJ)

Since the facts of the case and issue involved in both these Family Court Appeal and Civil Revision Petition are identical, these FCA and CRP are being taken up together and are being disposed of by way of this common judgment.

2. FCA No.109 of 2011, under Section 19 of the Family Court Act, 1984, is filed by the appellants/parents, challenging the order dated 20.12.2010, passed in FCOP No.238 of 2008 by the Judge, Family Court, Hyderabad, whereby, the subject FCOP No.238 of 2008 filed by the appellants/parents under Section 20 of the Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956 claiming maintenance of Rs.15,000/- per month each, from the respondent/son and to direct the respondent/son to meet their medical expenses, was allowed, directing the respondent/son to pay maintenance of Rs.6,000/- per month each to the appellants 1 & 2 towards their maintenance from the date of said order, on or before 10th of every succeeding month and further directed the respondent/son to continue to pay the same, so long as the appellants survive and

further directed that the respondent/son shall attend the medical necessities of the petitioner wherever they required.

3. Civil Revision Petition No.2020 of 2009, under the article 227 of the Constitution of India, is filed by the petitioners/parents, challenging the order, dated 24.03.2009, passed in I.A.No.913 of 2008 in FCOP No.238 of 2008 by the Judge, Family Court, Hyderabad whereby, the petition filed by the petitioners/parents under Section 151 of CPC claiming an amount of Rs.1,80,000/- towards medical expenses of the first petitioner was allowed in part, directing the respondent/son to pay a sum of Rs.50,000/- tentatively, which can be exempted if the medical bills are proved at the time of trial of the subject OP, to meet the medical expenses.

4. We have heard the submissions of the learned counsel for both sides and perused the record.

5. In the course of submissions, both the learned counsel submitted that the appellants herein/parents are being paid Rs.10,000/- per month each (in all Rs.20,000/-). In view of the said payment of Rs.20,000/- to the appellants herein, the appellants herein are not intending to proceed with the appeal as well as the CRP.

6. The said submission is taken on record.
7. Since, the appellants herein/parents are being paid Rs.10,000/- per month each (in all Rs.20,000/-), no further orders need be passed in this appeal as well as CRP.
8. With the above observation, the appeal as well as the CRP are disposed of.

Miscellaneous Petitions, if any, pending in this appeal as well as CRP shall stand closed. There shall be no order as to costs.

Dr. SHAMEEM AKTHER, J

NAGESH BHEEMAPAKA, J

Date: 22.12.2022
DSU/BVV