

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 2488 OF 2025**

ANIL GOEL

...APPELLANT

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

...RESPONDENTS

ORDER

1. This criminal appeal is directed against the judgment and order dated 22nd May, 2019 passed by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh.
2. Marriage of the appellant and the 2nd respondent was solemnised as per Hindu rites and customs in Panipat, Haryana on 26th February, 2001. Thereafter, they shifted to the United States of America¹. A daughter was born in their wedlock on 17th December, 2003. In due course of time, -April, 2009 to be precise - both the parties acquired citizenship of the USA. The daughter became a citizen of the USA by birth.
3. After acquiring the citizenship of the USA, unfortunately, the parties drifted apart owing to differences having arisen by and between them. Appellant filed for divorce before the Superior Court of Washington, County of Snohomish² on 3rd October, 2011. Their marital relationship terminated by reason of a decree for divorce passed by the local court on 24th July, 2012.

1 USA
2 local court

Prior to commencement of the divorce proceedings, the 2nd respondent had shifted to India with her daughter. On 6th November, 2015, the 2nd respondent applied³ under Section 125, Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973⁴ before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panipat, Haryana⁵ claiming maintenance for herself and her daughter.

4. Appellant challenged the proceedings before the High Court by filing a petition⁶ under Section 482, Cr. PC. *Vide* the impugned judgment and order, the High Court declined to quash the proceedings instituted by the 2nd respondent against the appellant.

5. The appeal was heard for quite some time on a couple of days. Confronted with certain important legal issues, on 8th May, 2025, Mr. Manoj Swarup, learned senior counsel for the 2nd respondent was heard to submit that she would not press her claim for maintenance against the appellant; however, the proceedings *qua* her daughter would be pressed before this Court seeking maintenance from the period the appellant failed to maintain his daughter till she attained majority, i.e., from 2011 till 2021. Having recorded such submissions, we had also requested Mr. Swarup and Mr. S. Niranjan Reddy, learned senior counsel appearing for the appellant, to find out the exact amount that would be necessary for meeting the educational expenses of their daughter as well as the expenses to be incurred in the future for her well-being, which the parties could endeavour to jointly bear.

3 Case No.74 of 2015
 4 Cr. PC
 5 relevant magistrate
 6 CRM-M No.9642 of 2017

6. We have been informed that despite earnest efforts of Mr. Reddy and Mr. Swarup, the parties have not been able to be *ad idem*.
7. We have, therefore, proceeded to hear the parties.
8. Upon such hearing, it is felt unnecessary to leave it to the parties once again to explore the desirability of burying their differences and arrive at an amicable settlement for the sake of their daughter; instead, we are of the opinion that it is high time that appropriate directions be made upon balancing the interest of the parties in the light of the support and assistance that their daughter would require to have a secure future.
9. We had the occasion to look into the income tax returns of the appellant for the last 10 years. Having regard to the appellant's total income as shown in such returns and considering the fact that the respondent is in private employment in the USA till date, coupled with the expenses that the appellant would likely incur for himself and his wife and child, in our view, interest of justice would be best served if the proceedings are terminated in the manner indicated hereafter.
10. The daughter of the parties is pursuing her graduation in the USA. She proposes to pursue studies even after graduation. In or about 5-6 years' time, she would be of marriageable age.
11. While we were inclined, taking an overall view of the matter, to direct the appellant to make payment of a lumpsum amount, Mr. Reddy (on

instructions received from the appellant) volunteered to offer lumpsum payment of Rs.4 crore to the 2nd respondent to be exclusively expended for their daughter's dignified and meaningful sustenance, including meeting her expenses to pursue the courses of study at the graduation/post-graduation levels and also for her marriage. Finding the offer of the appellant fair and reasonable, we accept the undertaking given on his behalf by Mr. Reddy that the said amount of Rs.4 crore shall be electronically transferred to the bank account of the 2nd respondent (upon the appellant being informed of the details thereof by her) in four equal quarterly instalments. The first instalment of Rs.1 crore be transferred within seven days of receipt of the account details from the 2nd respondent. After receipt of the first three instalments totalling Rs.3 crore, such amount shall be invested by the 2nd respondent in a fixed deposit account of a nationalised bank till the daughter's marriage is arranged. Copy of the fixed deposit receipt shall be shared by the 2nd respondent with the appellant. However, following receipt of the fourth instalment of Rs.1 crore, the 2nd respondent shall incur such expenses as are required by her daughter out of such amount but the 2nd respondent shall be under an obligation to provide to the appellant quarterly statements of expenditure so incurred. We reiterate, no part of any amount paid by the appellant in terms hereof shall be appropriated for any personal and other use of the 2nd respondent. Once payment of such amount of Rs.4 crore by transfer is effected, the same shall constitute full and final settlement of the appellant's liability to maintain his daughter.

12. Appellant, reportedly, has not spoken to his daughter for years. Since she

has attained majority, it is for her to decide whether to maintain any relationship with the appellant. We make no order in this behalf.

13. We are informed that the 2nd respondent has immediate plans to shift to India permanently. If indeed she does shift permanently and her daughter is in need of further amount over and above Rs.4 crore, as ordered, the 2nd respondent may agree to bear the same.
14. In the unlikely event of the appellant failing to transfer the aforesaid amount of Rs.4 crore within the period stipulated above and thereby breaching his undertaking given to us, this order shall automatically stand recalled and the appellant, apart from being liable for contempt, will expose himself to be proceeded against by the relevant magistrate under Section 125, Cr. PC. In such case, submissions of Mr. Swarup recorded by us in the earlier order dated May, 2025 as regards the 2nd respondent not pursuing her claim shall be of no effect. The proceedings may be taken to its logical conclusion, in accordance with law, on its own merits.
15. We clarify not having expressed any opinion on the merits of the rival contentions.
16. Subject to payment of the amount of Rs.4 crore by transfer, the proceedings before the relevant magistrate shall stand quashed and connected applications, if any, closed.
17. On the above terms, the appeal stands disposed of.

18. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand closed.

.....J.
(DIPANKAR DATTA)

.....J.
(MANMOHAN)

**NEW DELHI.
MAY 15, 2025.**

ITEM NO.26

COURT NO.13

SECTION II-B

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Criminal Appeal No(s). 2488/2025

ANIL GOEL

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

THE STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 109181/2019 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 220608/2024 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

IA No. 260360/2023 - PERMISSION TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS/FACTS/ANNEXURES

Date : 15-05-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DIPANKAR DATTA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANMOHAN

For Appellant(s) : Mr. S. Niranjan Reddy, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Ashutosh Ghade, AOR
Mr. Sahil Raveen, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Deepak Thukral, A.A.G.
Mr. Akshay Amritanshu, AOR
Ms. Pragya Upadhyay, Adv.
Mr. Nikhil Goyal, Adv.
Ms. Drishti Rawal, Adv.
Ms. Drishti Saraf, Adv.

Mr. Manoj Swaroop, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Neelmani Pant, Adv.
Mr. Harish Pandey, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The appeal stands disposed of in terms of the signed order.
2. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

(JATINDER KAUR)
P.S. to REGISTRAR

(SUDHIR KUMAR SHARMA)
COURT MASTER (NSH)

[Signed order is placed on the file]