



IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

MATA No.326 OF 2023

Sasank Sekhar Choudhury

....

Appellant

Represented By Adv. –
Mr. Krushna Sukla, Advocate

-versus-

Sushri Sucharita Samal

....

Respondent

Represented By Adv. –
Mr. G. P. Samal, Advocate

CORAM:

JUSTICE MANASH RANJAN PATHAK

JUSTICE MRUGANKA SEKHAR SAHOO

ORDER

09.10.2025

(Hybrid Mode)

Order No.

6.

1. Referring to the order dated 01.09.2025, learned counsel for the appellant seeks adjournment. Our earlier order dated 01.09.2025 is reiterated.

“1. Learned counsel for appellant furnishes a draft of ₹20,000/- in response to the observations made in the order dated 7.8.2025. The appellant by challenging the decree in appeal, i.e., award of ₹25,00,000/- towards the alimony payable to the respondent-wife was directed to secure the decree. Today when the matter is taken up an amount of ₹20,000/- in form of a draft to secure the decree is offered.

We reject the prayer by the appellant to deposit ₹20,000/- to secure the decree.



2. It is not disputed at the Bar that the appellant has himself obtained the decree by filing C.P. No. 701 of 2020 seeking decree of divorce. Concededly the appellant was working as Assistant Consultant in a multi national company at Eschborn, Germany. Considering the said aspect, alimony of ₹25,00,000/- was awarded.

3. It is contended by learned counsel for appellant that the respondent is also working and earning, no alimony should have been granted. In our considered opinion such submission is contrary to the settled position of law. In any event the appellant has to pay alimony as he has obtained a decree of divorce. However, since the matter needs further hearing, we are not expressing any further opinion regarding above submission of the learned counsel for appellant that the appellant is not supposed to give any alimony directed by Court while he has obtained a decree of divorce.

4. List on 9th of October, 2025.

We record that despite our order dated 7.8.2025 appellant has chosen not to secure the decree for obtaining an interim order. It is further clarified that the respondent shall have the liberty to proceed in execution of the decree. Pendency of the appeal shall not in any manner affect the execution of the decree.”

2. Accordingly, the matter is adjourned.

3. As suggested by the learned counsel for the appellant, list on 26.11.2025.

(Manash Ranjan Pathak)
Judge

(Mruganka Sekhar Sahoo)
Judge

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
Signed by: GAGAN BIHARI SAMAL
Reason: Authentication
Location: ohc
Date: 13-Oct-2025 20:46:23

