



134

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-48766-2025**

Date of Decision:- 03.09.2025

**Manik Sachdeva**

....Petitioner

Vs.

**Master Govind (Minor)**

....Respondent

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE AMARJOT BHATTI**

Present:- Mr. Fateh Saini, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMARJOT BHATTI, J. (Oral)**

1. Petitioner Manik Sachdeva has filed petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of impugned order dated 25.09.2024 (Annexure P-1) in execution application No. 1136 of 2022 titled “Master Govind vs. Manik Sachdeva”, whereby learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court at Faridabad has directed petitioner to deposit Rs. 60,000/- per month in the account of respondent against amount awarded in favour of respondent at the rate of Rs. 15,000/- per month, being illegal and not sustainable in the eyes of law or any order or direction which the Court may deem fit in the given facts and circumstances of case.

2. Learned counsel for petitioner referred to impugned order dated 25.09.2024 (Annexure P-1) vide which petitioner/JD himself gave undertaking that he will deposit Rs. 60,000/- per month in the account of DH i.e. his son Master Govind with effect from November, 2024 and this amount will be deposited before 10<sup>th</sup> of every month. Copy of that statement is Annexure P-6. Now, learned counsel for petitioner has annexed

*zimni* orders (Annexures P-2 to P-5) vide which he has deposited various amounts before Executing Court. At this stage, it is pointed out that petitioner is facing financial hardship, therefore, he is not in a position to deposit Rs. 60,000/- per month as per his own statement (Annexure P-6). Hence, the present petition.

3. I have considered the arguments and have gone through the record carefully. Firstly present petitioner by making his own statement in Executing Court on 25.09.2024 agreed to deposit Rs. 60,000/- per month towards arrears of maintenance due towards him. It is not disputed that maintenance was awarded to his minor son at the rate of Rs. 15,000/- per month. However, petitioner was in huge arrears and as per his own undertaking, impugned order dated 25.09.2024 (Annexure P-1) was passed.

In the light of this, I do not find any reason to interfere in aforesaid impugned order and present petition is, accordingly, dismissed. However, petitioner is at liberty to raise the issue regarding financial hardship before the Executing Court which can be considered by the Court concerned as per law.

4. Pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall also stands disposed of accordingly.

(AMARJOT BHATTI)  
JUDGE

03.09.2025

*lalit*

|                           |   |        |
|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| Whether reportable        | : | Yes/No |