HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Criminal Revision No. 144 of 2026

27 April, 2026

Major Surendra Arora --Revisionist

Versus

Megha Kataria --Respondent

Presence:-
Ms. Shruti Joshi, learned counsel with Ms. Nisha Dhami learned counsel for the revisionist.
Mr. Yash Bisht, learned counsel holding the brief of Mr. Vikas Bahuguna, learned counsel for the respondent.

Shri Rakesh Thapliyal, J.

1. Earlier several efforts were made for the amicable settlement of both the parties who married in the year of 2024, and, though, the revisionist/husband was ready to settle the dispute and wanted to live with the respondent/wife but the respondent/wife strictly refused to live with the husband due to his past conduct behavior including character. She submits that she does not want to remember her past and wants to live in future. She submits that earlier, though, she wants some amount towards permanent alimony of about Rs. 70 lakhs but now she has decided not ask for a single penny towards permanent alimony.

2. The revisionist is present and respondent/wife also joined the proceeding through V.C.

3. On the previous occasion when respondent/wife proposes Rs. 70 lakhs towards permanent alimony, the

revisionist proposed only Rs. 6 lakhs and that is the reason that the respondent/wife now have decided not to ask for permanent alimony. What ultimately she wants, permanent separation from the revisionist. There is no issue from their marriage and both of them are living separately since 23.10.2024.

4. When this Court ask from the respondent/wife why she is not coming forward to settle the dispute with the revisionist, she submits that she is well qualified having B.Tech and M.Tech degree and gold medalist and qualified C.DOT examination and now doing PhD from IIT Delhi in Artificial Intelligence and is working with IIT project and she has better future prospects and, therefore, she does not want to remember horrible memories with the revisionist. She also submits that there are arrear towards maintenance, i.e., Rs. 1.40 lakhs but she is also not asking for the said amount.

5. The revisionist who is present in Court already filed an affidavit on 22.04.2026 wherein he make a statement that at present he is not having any objectionable photographs and the video and had only certain personal photographs of the honeymoon period which cannot be termed as obscene in nature and he has already deleted all such photographs and the videos. The affidavit is taken on record. Taking into consideration the statement as given in the affidavit, this Court hope and trust that the revisionist will not upload any such photographs and videos in any social platform.

6. Since, there is no dispute with regard to permanent alimony, as respondent/wife is not asking for permanent

alimony, therefore, both the parties are directed to file divorce petition before the Principal Judge, Family Court, Dehradun positively within two weeks to seek divorce by mutual consent and the Family Court is further directed to expedite the divorce petition within one month positively. The Family Court is further directed to waive off the statutory period of judicial separation, as both of them are living separately since long back. It is made clear that as and when divorce decree is passed by the Family Court, the proceedings initiated by the respondent/wife under Section 144, 144(1) of BNSS 2023 would automatically closed.

7. With the observations and directions, as above, instant criminal revision is disposed of finally

(Rakesh Thapliyal, J.)

Parul