



\$~18

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

+ CRL.REV.P. 14/2015 CRL.M.A. 241/2015 CRL.M.A. 19716/2022

SABIR HUSAIN

.....Petitioner

Through: M. Rais Farooqui and Ms. Iffat
Fatima, Advocates.

versus

MUMTAZ BEGUM & ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mohd. Hasibuddin, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

% **09.12.2024**

1. This revision petition has been filed impugning the judgment dated 23rd September, 2014 passed by the Principal Judge, Family Courts, North-East District, Vishwas Nagar, Delhi.
2. By the said impugned order, maintenance under Section 125 Cr.P.C. was awarded to the respondents. Respondent No.1 is the wife whereas respondent Nos.2-4 are children born out of the wedlock.
3. When the impugned order was passed, respondent No.2 was already major, having attained the age of majority on 18th March 2011. Respondent Nos.3 & 4 have attained the age of majority on 24th November 2014 and on 14th November 2017, respectively, as stated in paragraph 19 of the impugned order.
4. Perusal of the impugned order would show that, in the facts and circumstances, respondent No.1 was declared as not entitled to any



maintenance and directions were passed for maintenance only till the age of majority was attained. As regards respondent Nos. 3 & 4, similar directions were passed for getting maintenance at Rs.5,750/- from the date of the order till the date of majority and Rs.11,500/- from the date of the order till the date of majority for respondent No.4. Respondent Nos. 3 and 4 were also entitled to get arrears @Rs. 1000/- per month collectively from date of filing the petition till the date of the decision.

5. This Court had passed an order dated 8th November, 2016 recording that the amount of Rs.5 lacs was pending against the petitioner. The Court had directed the petitioner to clear arrears of maintenance before the next date of hearing and directed to pay future monthly maintenance in terms of the order of the Trial Court without any default. There has been no stay passed by this Court on the impugned order since the last nine years when the matter has been pending.

6. Counsel for petitioner has made a statement that about Rs.8,32,260/- has already been paid and no execution petitions are pending against the petitioner as on date.

7. A perusal of the impugned order shows that the aspects have been considered fairly and there is no reason for this Court to interfere in the said order.

8. This Court does not find any illegality and impropriety in the said order. Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.

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

ANISH DAYAL, J

DECEMBER 9, 2024/ak