

**Keshav Nand Sharma v. Amita Kumari a/w
connected matter**

**Cr. Revision (FC) No.13 of 2025
a/w Cr.MP (M) No.1816 of 2025**

Cr. Revision (FC) No.13 of 2025

21.07.2026. Present: Mr. Naresh K. Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Vinod Kumar Thakur, Advocate, for the respondent.

Cr.MP (M) No.1816 of 2025

Mr. Vinod Kumar Thakur, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Naresh K. Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Cr.MP (M) No.1816 of 2025

This application has been filed for condonation of delay in filing the revision petition against impugned order dated 03.10.2024 passed by the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, Ghumarwin, District Bilaspur, whereby maintenance has been awarded in favour of the son, but prayer of petitioner-Amita Kumari has been declined.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that, after passing of the impugned order, she remained bed-ridden for about three to four months. It is further averred that she was not aware of the fact that order

passed by the learned Family Court can be challenged before the High Court. According to her, neither she was advised by her counsel in this regard nor informed about the available legal remedy. She came to know about the said remedy only upon receipt of summons issued by this Court in Criminal Revision No.13 of 2025 preferred by respondent-husband, wherein she had been directed to appear before this Court.

3. In aforesaid facts and circumstances, applicant-petitioner-Amita Kumari approached this Court and filed the present application along with proposed Criminal Revision against the impugned order dated 03.10.2024, which already under challenge in *Criminal Appeal No.13 of 2025*, titled *Keshav Nand Sharma v. Amita Kumari*, preferred by the respondent-husband, which stands admitted and is awaiting final adjudication.

4. Prayer of the applicant-petitioner has been vehemently opposed by the learned counsel for the respondent on the ground that day to day delay, as required to be explained under law, has not been explained and further the ailment was not of such a

nature that applicant could not come to High Court to assail the order within limitation period or immediately after receiving the summons in the aforesaid criminal revision petition.

5. As the impugned order proposed to be challenged by the applicant-Amita Kumari is already under challenge in Criminal Revision (FC) No.13 of 2025 preferred by the respondent-husband and considering the explanation furnished by the applicant, this Court is satisfied that sufficient cause has been shown for not preferring the revision petition within the prescribed period of limitation.

6. Accordingly, the delay in filing the revision petition is condoned.

7. Application is allowed and stands disposed of.

Cr. Revision No. _____ of 2026
[Cr. Rev (FC) ST No.6256 of 2025]

8. Be registered.

9. Respondent is duly represented.

10. Admit.

11. List the matter for hearing along with *Criminal Revision (FC) No.13 of 2025*, in due course.

Cr. Revision (FC) No.13 of 2025

12. The matter already stands admitted vide order dated 27.11.2025. List the same in due course.

(Vivek Singh Thakur)
Judge

(Ranjan Sharma)
Judge

July 21, 2026
[Shivender]