



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
AT AMARAVATI
(Special Original Jurisdiction)**

[3457]

WEDNESDAY, THE NINETEENTH DAY OF MARCH
TWO THOUSAND AND TWENTY FIVE

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N

CRIMINAL PETITION NO: 2940/2025

Between:

J. Mohammed Jaffer

...PETITIONER/ACCUSED

AND

Mohammed Fouziya and Others

...RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT(S)

Counsel for the Petitioner/accused:

1.T JANARDHAN RAO

Counsel for the Respondent/complainant(S):

1.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR

2.

The Court made the following:

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE HARINATH.N**CRIMINAL PETITION No.2940 OF 2025****ORDER:**

1. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for the State.
2. The petitioner is aggrieved by the docket order, dated 27.02.2025, in Crl. M.P. No. 32 of 2025 in D.V.C. No. 3 of 2020, passed by the Judicial First Class Magistrate, Sathyavedu, directing payment of arrears amounting to Rs.10,00,000/- for 50 months, at the rate of Rs.20,000/- per month.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in D.V.C.No.3 of 2020, the petitioner was set ex parte and passed an order dated 18.01.2024 granting monthly maintenance at Rs.10,000/- for the 1st petitioner and Rs.5,000/- each for petitioners 2 and 3, who are the minor children, totaling Rs.10,000/-. Aggrieved by the same, the petitioner filed Crl.A.No.30 of 2024 before the XII Additional District & Sessions Judge, Chittoor, which was dismissed on 06.09.2024. Subsequently, a criminal revision case was filed before this Court, and the same is pending.
4. Consequent upon the failure of the petitioner to comply with the order passed in D.V.C. for the past 50 months, i.e., from the date of the petition i.e., 21.10.2020, respondents 1 to 3 herein filed Crl. M.P. No. 32 of 2025 in D.V.C. No. 3 of 2020, wherein the petitioner was directed to

pay arrears of maintenance. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not given an opportunity to file a counter in the Crl. M.P.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner is liable to pay maintenance for the last 50 months, commencing from 21.10.2020. Upon perusal of the order, this Court finds that the learned Magistrate has rightly considered the issue and passed the impugned order and finds no ground to interfere with docket the order passed by the learned Magistrate, and as such, the criminal petition is devoid of merits.
6. Hence, the criminal petition is dismissed.
7. Miscellaneous petitions, if any, pending in this criminal petition shall stand closed.

JUSTICE HARINATH.N

Dt.19.03.2025

BV