



\$~2

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.REV.P. 566/2024 CRL.M.A. 19665/2024**

SUNNY BHIWAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Munish Kumar Gaur, Mr. Umesh
Sharma, Ms. Shivani and Mr. Sumit
Choudhary, Advs.

versus

GUNJAN SONDHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Pawan Reley, Mr. Akshay Lodhi,
Ms. Simran Singh, Mr. Gaurav
Kumar&Ms. Lashika Singh,
Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

% **12.07.2024**

1. This revision petition is filed against order dated 30th November 2023 passed in MT No.170/2020, by Principal Judge Family Court, Karkardooma Courts. The impugned order confirms the final maintenance under section 125 Cr.P.Cat Rs, 22,500/- per month to the respondent-wife with effect from the date of filing of petition (which was filed on 17th March 2020) till the date of her re-marriage, or till her lifetime, or till the date she is able to earn sufficiently to maintain herself. Other directions have also been passed in the impugned order.

2. An interim maintenance order was passed on 23rd December 2021 in these proceedings directing payment of Rs.20,000/- per month, which was challenged by petitioner before this Court in Crl. Rev. Pet. 352/2022. By order dated 1st June 2022, this Court stayed execution of the same subject to



payment of Rs. 3,00,000/- to be deposited within a period of 15 days from that order. Counsel for petitioner states that the said amount was duly deposited.

3. The assertions of petitioner are effectively that they have spent funds on illness of his mother, they are stationed in Kolkata, and that the respondent-wife is a B.D.S., a qualified Dental Practitioner, and is earning Rs.65,000/- per month.

4. Refuting this, counsel for the respondent states that there is no evidence of issue of dependency, as evident from para 18 of the impugned order. As regards gainful employment of respondent-wife, impugned order has traversed through the evidence and noted that petitioner is not been able to prove the same. This aspect is narrated in para 20 of the impugned order.

5. Further, it is stated that divorce petition, filed by the petitioner, has been dismissed by the Court against which petitioner has filed an appeal which is yet to be listed.

6. The marriage of petitioner and respondent no.2 lasted only 45 days, after which they separated, which, as per respondent, was due to misbehavior of petitioner and his family.

7. The Court has perused the impugned order and order dated 23rd December 2021 on interim maintenance and heard the parties and finds no reason to interfere with the said order. The Court has not passed any observations of its own, on merits, in this revision petition.

8. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

9. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

JULY 12, 2024/sm