

## **ORDER BELOW EXH.18 IN H.M.P. NO.63/2018**

Respondent has filed the present application for recovery of Rs.84,000/- from the petitioner.

2. It is asserted by her that the Court has awarded interim maintenance of Rs.6,500/- to her vide order dated 21.02.2019 passed below application (Exh.9) with effect from 30.07.2018. The Court was pleased to direct the petitioner to pay the said amount on or before the 10<sup>th</sup> day of each month. Petitioner is not depositing the amount, as directed. Hence, the application.

3. Petitioner has filed the say and opposed the application contending that the application is not tenable as per the provisions of law. Ultimately, he has prayed for rejecting the application.

4. Perused the record. Heard both sides. Only point which arise for consideration is whether the respondent has made out a case to allow the application ?

5. Most of the facts are not disputed. It is the case of the respondent that the petitioner is not depositing the interim maintenance amount, as directed. Applicant can take appropriate steps to get the said order enforced/executed. She as liberty to take such steps which are available to her. In the circumstances, present application cannot be kept pending for indefinite period. Hence, the application stands disposed of.

Date : **15.01.2020.**

3<sup>rd</sup> Jt. Civil Judge (S.D.)  
**Washim.**

**CERTIFICATE**

I affirm that the contents of this P.D.F. file *Order* are same word to word as per original Judgment.

Name of Stenographer : ***Shivam B. Patange.***

Court & Judge Name : **S.K.Khan,**  
3<sup>rd</sup> Jt. Civil Judge (S.D.) Washim.

Date of Order : 15.01.2020.

Order signed by the  
Presiding Officer on : 15.01.2020.

Order uploaded on : **16.01.2020.**