



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK
CRLREV No.821 of 2025

Saroj Kumar Das **Petitioner**
Mr. S.C. Acharya, Advocate

-Versus-

Mamata Sahani **Opposite Party**
Mr. B. Pujari, Advocate

CORAM:
MR. JUSTICE R.K. PATTANAIK

ORDER
11.12.2025

Order No.

03.

1. Heard learned counsel for the respective parties.
2. Instant revision is filed by the petitioner challenging the impugned order dated 12th September, 2025 at Annexure-4 passed in connection with Cr. P. No.102 of 2025 by the learned Judge, Family Court, Jajpur on the grounds stated.
3. Mr. Acharya, learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. does not reveal the details of the grounds demanding maintenance in terms of Section 125 Cr.P.C. read with Section 144 BNSS. The further submission is that the application does not disclose and plead the ingredients of Section 144 BNSS while demanding maintenance from the petitioner. On the contrary, Mr. Pujari, learned counsel for the opposite party submits that the learned court below did not commit any error in rejecting such an application vide Annexure-4.



4. Today, Mr. Pujari, learned counsel for the opposite party produced a copy of the mediation report dated 19th August, 2025 which has become unsuccessful indicating therein that the petitioner is not interested to settle the dispute with such mediation.

5. Perused the application under Section 125 Cr.P.C. read with Section 144 BNSS as at Annexure-1. The Court upon reading the same finds that there has been a demand of maintenance from the petitioner. The necessary details starting from the marriage between the parties and reason behind such demand have been described in Annexure-1. The claim is that essential ingredients of Section 144 BNSS are not mentioned therein. The Court is not inclined to accept any such intention of Mr. Acharya, learned counsel for the petitioner. The filing of the application with bare minimum details demanding maintenance from the petitioner have been disclosed by the opposite party. Such a plea from the petitioner could not have been entertained by the learned court below and rightly so and therefore, the Court is not inclined to interfere with the impugned order dated 12th September, 2025 at Annexure-4.

6. Accordingly, it is ordered.

7. In the result, the revision petition stands dismissed.

(R.K. Pattanaik)
Judge