



2026:CGHC:4114

NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****CRR No. 431 of 2024**

Virendra Chandrakar S/o Late Lakhan Lal Aged About 30 Years R/o Village Dhanoura P.S. Pipariya, District Kabirdham (C.G.), (The Respondent No. 1 Has Wrongly Given The Detail Of Petitioner As Director/owner Bajrang Enterprises Shop Number 237, Block 6 Transport Nagar Ravabhantha Raipur (C.G.) And Therefore The Above Detail Is Mentioned In The Impugned Order)

... Applicant**versus**

1 - Smt. Rani Chandrakar @ Bageshwari Aged About 27 Years W/o Virendra Chandrakar, R/o Gonjadih, Village Dhanoura P.S. Pipariya District Kabirdham (C.G.), At Present R/o Village Koudiya P.S. Pipariya District Kabirdham (C.G.)

2 - Garvik S/o Virendra Chandrakar, Aged About 4 Months, Minor Through His Natural Guardian Mother Smt. Rani Chandrakar @ Bageshwari, R/o Gonjadih, Village Dhanoura P.S. Pipariya District Kabirdham (C.G.), At Present R/o Village Koudiya P.S. Pipariya District Kabirdham (C.G.)

... Respondent

For Applicant : Ms. Nilu Kumari Singh, Advocate, on behalf of Mr. F.S. Khare, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice**Order on Board****23/01/2026**

1. The applicant has filed this criminal revision against the order dated 21.04.2023 passed by learned Family Court Kawardha (Kabirdham), District – Kabirdham (C.G.) in Misc. Cr. Case No. 37/2022, whereby, the learned Family Court allowed the application under Section 125 of CrPC for grant of maintenance filed by the applicants and directed the respondent to pay total Rs.4,500/- per month to respondents.
2. It transpires from the cause list that the present criminal revision is suffering from several defects and defaults. On 25.04.2024, when the

matter was taken up by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the applicant was granted two weeks' time, to remove the said defects.

3. Despite the lapse of a considerable period thereafter, the applicant has failed to remove the defects till date. The record further reveals that the present revision has been filed with a delay of 221 days. However, no application for condonation of delay, supported by a proper affidavit, has been filed on behalf of the applicant.
4. The applicant has shown complete negligence and lack of diligence in prosecuting the present revision. Even after availing sufficient opportunity granted by this Court, the defects have not been cured, nor application for condonation of delay has been filed to explain the inordinate delay in filing the revision.
5. It is well settled that a litigant who approaches the Court must do so with clean hands and due diligence. The negligence in prosecuting the present revision, coupled with the unexplained delay and persistent non-compliance of the directions issued by this Court, clearly attracts the doctrine of laches, thereby disentitling the applicant from any discretionary relief.
6. Accordingly, the revision is hereby **dismissed** on the ground of delay and laches.
7. Let a copy of this order be transmitted to the trial Court concerned for necessary information and compliance, forthwith.

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice