



CRM-M-22669-2025

-1-

136

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M-22669-2025**

**Date of Decision: 30.04.2025**

\*\*\*\*

Surender

..... Petitioner

Versus

Anita Devi alias Nita and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr. Pardeep Kumar, Advocate,  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 praying for quashing/setting aside the order dated 28.02.2025 passed by learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Kaithal directing the Union Bank of India, Sector 20, HUDA, Kaithal to transfer the amount of Rs.13,000/- per month from the account of the petitioner to the account of the respondent/wife by 15<sup>th</sup> of every month.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that vide Annexure P-1, the Executing Court has passed an order with regard to execution of the judgment dated 25.09.2015 which has been passed by learned JMIC, Kaithal under Section 125 Cr.P.C. against the petitioner and in favour of the respondents. He further submitted that the petitioner does not dispute the fact that as per the order passed under Section 125 Cr.P.C., he is liable to pay the amount as stated in the impugned order but his only grievance is with regard to mode of transfer of payment wherein it has been so directed by learned

**CRM-M-22669-2025****-2-**

Executing Court that the amount which the petitioner has been made liable to pay is to be transferred from the account of the petitioner to the account of the respondent/wife duly vide the account number mentioned.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. The only grievance of the petitioner is with regard to the mode of transfer of payment in execution of order passed under Section 125 Cr.P.C. which was erroneous because although liability of the petitioner was not in dispute as per the order passed against him but the fact that the amount which is to be deposited by way of transfer from the account of the petitioner to the account of the respondent/wife was not proper.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the considered view that no such illegality and perversity can be found in the impugned order. The liability of the petitioner to pay the amount has not been disputed by learned counsel for the petitioner but only dispute which was raised by learned counsel for the petitioner was with regard to the mode of execution and learned counsel for the petitioner has not been able to show as to how the impugned order is erroneous. Therefore, no ground is made out to interfere in the impugned order.

6. Consequently, the present petition is hereby dismissed.

**30.04.2025***Bhumika***(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)  
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No  
2. Whether reportable: Yes/No