



\$~131

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 277/2026 & CRL.M.A. 16155/2026,
CRL.M.A. 16156/2026, CRL.M.A. 16157/2026

MOHD. SUHAILRevisionist

Through: Mr. Puneet Dhawan, Advocate
(DHCLSC)

versus

SANA ALI & ORS.Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **19.05.2026**

1. By way of this petition under Section 397 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioner assails an ad-interim order of maintenance granted by the Family Court *vide* order dated 30.10.2025 in MT. 409/2024, in favour of respondents [wife and two minor daughters].
2. By way of the impugned order dated 30.10.2025, the petitioner has been directed to pay ad-interim maintenance in the sum of Rs. 4,000/- per month for each of the three respondents. I am informed that the interim maintenance application remains pending before the Family Court.
3. Mr. Puneet Dhawan, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that the petitioner's income is only Rs. 12,000/- per month. He further submits that execution proceedings have also since been initiated against the petitioner.
4. I am not inclined to exercise the Court's revisional jurisdiction at this stage. Revision of an order is permissible only when it is vitiated by an error of jurisdiction, or patent irregularity. I do not find such a case to be made out in this petition. The application for interim maintenance



remains pending before the Family Court and the ad-interim maintenance granted at this stage, would in any event be subject to the result of the interim maintenance application. The Family Court came to the aforesaid ad-interim quantum of maintenance, having regard to the minimum wages for an unskilled worker, which is not entirely implausible, so as to warrant interference in revision. In any event, the quantum of the petitioner's income will be considered on evidence, at the stage of deciding the interim maintenance application.

5. The petitioner has also conducted himself in a manner which gives rise to a doubt as to his intention to cause unnecessary delay in the proceedings. The petitioner did not even appear before the Family Court until non-bailable warrants were issued against him. The Court, in the impugned order has noted that, even thereafter, the petitioner delayed the filing of the reply by more than 120 days, which was nonetheless taken on record. The present petition has also been filed after delay of over 100 days.

6. In view of the above, the revision petition, alongwith pending applications, is dismissed, without prejudice to the rights and contentions of the parties before the Family Court.

7. At this stage, Mr. Dhawan submits that an opportunity be granted for the parties to explore the possibility of settlement. The petitioner is at liberty to make this request before the Family Court, which may pass appropriate directions.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 19, 2026/'pv'/AD/