

**HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE B. SESHASAYANA REDDY**

**Crl.R.C.No. 785 of 2012**

**DATE: 30.05.2012**

Between:

V.Bharathi Reddy and another  
Petitioners

And

V. Sreedhara Reddy  
and another  
Respondents

—

---

—

---

—

---

---

---

---

1

-  
-  
-  
-  
-  
-  
-  
-  
-  
-  
-

**JUDGMENT:-**

This revision is directed against the order dated 14.05.2012 passed by the Judge, Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B. Nagar, Hyderabad in M.C.No. 103 of 2011.

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and perused the order under revision.

The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1<sup>st</sup> petitioner – V.Bharathi Reddy has been suffering from serious ailment and therefore, she was not able to present before the trial Court on 14.05.2012. The learned counsel seeks extension of time for appearance of the petitioners before the Family Court, Ranga Reddy District. The petitioners filed M.C. No. 103 of 2011 claiming maintenance at the rate of Rs.75,000/- p.m. They also filed CrI.M.P.No. 1309 of 2011 under Section 125(2) Cr.P.C. seeking interim maintenance at the rate of Rs.35,000/- per month. The learned Judge of the Family Court, by order dated 09.01.2012, granted maintenance at the rate of Rs.4,000/- p.m. to the petitioners herein. The respondent filed CrI.R.C. No. 318 of 2012 assailing the order dated 09.01.2012 passed in CrI.M.P.No. 1309 of 2011 in M.C. No. 103 of 2011. The said revision came to be disposed of by this Court on 27.02.2012. The relevant portion of the order needs to be noted and it reads thus:

“Coming to the facts of the case on hand, the petitioner pleaded before the Family Court that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent-wife is having

Rs.12.00 lakhs fixed deposit in her name and she is self-sufficient. Having pleaded self-sufficiency of respondent No.1-wife, the petitioner failed to place any material to show that respondent No.1-wife has fixed deposit in her name. The petitioner is stated to be a legal practitioner. No proof has been filed by the petitioner to show that respondent No.1-wife is an earning member nor any property stands in her name by which she derives income.

In that view of the matter, I do not see any valid ground to interfere with the order, dated 09.01.2011, passed by the learned Judge of the Family Court, Ranga Reddy District at L.B.Nagar, Hyderabad in CrI.M.P.No. 1309 of 2011 in M.C. No. 103 of 2011.

Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is dismissed. However, the learned Judge of the Family Court, Ranga Reddy District, at L.B. Nagar, Hyderabad is directed to dispose of M.C.No. 103 of 2011 as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.”

Pursuant to the directions given by this Court, the learned Judge of the Family Court took up an enquiry in M.C.No. 103 of 2011. Since the petitioners remained absent on 14.05.2012, the learned Judge directed the petitioners to attend the Court on 31.05.2012 and imposed costs of Rs.100/- by order dated 14.05.2012. Assailing the said order in M.C.No.103 of 2011, this Criminal Revision Case has been filed.

The learned Judge, Family Court, expedited the enquiry in M.C.No. 103 of 2011 pursuant to the directions given by this Court in CrI.R.C.No.318 of 2012. I do not see any irregularity or illegality in the order impugned in this revision. If the petitioners have any difficulty to appear before the Court on 31.05.2012, they are at liberty to make an application before the learned Judge, Family Court explaining reasons and it is for the learned Judge to consider or not to consider the application. I do not see valid ground to interfere with the impugned order.

Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed at the

admission stage.

---

**REDDY, J**  
30.05.2012  
bcj

**B. SESHASAYANA**