

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
Cr. Revision No.750 of 2025

Manoranjan Prasad Mandal, aged about 63 years, son of Late Upin Chandra Mandal, resident of Flat No.402, Baldeo Apartment, near Pragati, Nursing Home, Saraidhela, P.O. + P.S. – Saraidhela, Dist. Dhanbad (Jharkhand), 827001. ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. Moni Mandal, wife of Shri Manoranjan Prasad Mandal, Resident of Flat No. N-3/12, Gold Apartment, Vatika Green City, Dimna Road, Mango, P.O. & P.S. – Mango, District – East Singhbhum, (Jharkhand), 831012. ... Opp. Parties

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

 For the Petitioner : Mr. Prakhar Harit, Advocate.
 For the State : Mrs. Anuradha Sahay, APP

4/19.01.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned counsel appearing for the State.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that IA No. 7795 of 2025 has been filed for condonation of delay of 238 days. He submits that the petitioner was looking after the two major daughter of the petitioner and for that he has travelled to Delhi and Kolkata to help them in completing their studies. In view of that, the delay has occurred.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the State submits that there is no sufficient explanation in the said IA.

4. Considering that the petitioner happened to be the father and was looking after the welfare of the two major daughters, in view of that, the delay of 238 days has been occurred.

5. In view of that, the delay in filing of the revision petition is hereby condoned and the IA No. 7795 of 2025 is allowed and

disposed of.

6. This petition has been filed for challenging the judgment dated 3/7/2024 passed by the Learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court No. II in Original Maintenance Case No.339 of 2018, whereby the learned court has been pleased to allow the maintenance amount of Rs.10,000/- per month to both of the minor sons till they attain the age of majority and further amount of Rs.10,000/- per month to the daughter of the parties, until she gets majority or gainfully employed. He further submits that the learned court has wrongly directed to pay the maintenance from the date of filing of the application. In view of that, the impugned order may kindly be modified. He further submits that the father is ready to maintain the children.

7. Learned counsel appearing for the State submits that principle is that, from the date of the filing of the application, the maintenances are being allowed by the Courts. In view of that, there is no illegality in the impugned order.

8. It is admitted position that the petitioner is the father of the children. There is no order of maintenance to the wife. Only looking to the welfare of the children, the said order has been passed by the learned Family Court and that too is a very meager amount. Learned trial court has considered the statements of both the sides and had framed the issues and considered each and every document brought on record marked as exhibits. The petitioner herein is retired from the post of Joint Commissioner from the Sales Tax Department and he is receiving the pension of Rs.90,000/- per month and considering the

principle of section 125 of CrPC., the learned court has rightly passed the order of maintenance in favour of the children only. The petitioner is the father and he is bound to maintain the children.

9. In view of the above, there is no illegality in the impugned order and as such, this revision petition is dismissed. Pending petition, if any, also stands disposed of.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

19.01.2026
R.Kumar