

Shivgan

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
REVISION APPLICATION NO.211 OF 2016

Jayant Sudhakar Kulkarni

...Applicant

Versus

Madhavi Jayant Kulkarni and Anr.

...Respondents

*None for the Applicant.***Mr Milind R Deshpande**, *for the Respondent No.1.***Mr Jayesh Yagnik**, *APP for the Respondent No.2-State.***CORAM: Dr. Neela Gokhale, J.****DATED: 3rd January 2024****PC:-**

1. The Applicant-Husband has assailed the judgment and order dated 16th February 2016 passed by the Family Court of Solapur. By the said order, the Family Court awarded maintenance of Rs.8,000/- per month to the Respondent No.1-Wife. The order impugned herein is passed in the petition filed by the Respondent No.1-Wife under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

2. Order dated 16th June 2017 of this Court records submissions of both the counsels that they were exploring possibility of settlement out of Court. None of the parties have reported any progress in respect of the settlement.

3. By order dated 20th June 2016, the Applicant-Husband had undertaken to clear the entire arrears of maintenance before the next date. Mr. Milind Deshpande, learned counsel for the Respondent No.1-Wife states that though the Applicant-Husband has deposited some amount, there are still substantial arrears of maintenance yet to be deposited by the Applicant-Husband.

4. By order dated 19th July 2017, this Court had directed the office to place the matter on board on 16th August 2017 for 'Dismissal'. However, it is seen that both the parties through their counsels appeared before the Court on 30th October 2017 and a statement was made by the counsel of the Applicant-Husband, on instructions, that arrears of maintenance would be cleared on or before 6th November 2017. Till date, there is no information furnished by the Applicant-Husband to the Registry regarding deposit of arrears of maintenance. On the past two dates, none have appeared for the Applicant-Husband. Even today, none appear for the Applicant-Husband.

5. In view of the foregoing, the revision application is dismissed for want of prosecution.

(Dr. Neela Gokhale, J)