

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1319 OF 2014**

Nilesh Wasudeo Shinde ... Petitioner  
V/s.  
The State of Maharashtra & Anr. ... Respondents

Ms. Bhakti N. Deshpande for the Petitioner.  
Mr. A.S. Shitole, A.P.P. for the State.

**CORAM : A. V. NIRGUDE, J.**

**DATE : 27<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER, 2015.**

**P.C. :**

1. This Writ Petition challenges order dated 24.03.2014 passed by learned J.M.F.C. Panvel, directing the petitioner to provide copies of certain documents to respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 has filed an application for maintenance etc. Under the provisions of Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005, on the pretext that getting admission to the minor son of the parties. Respondent No.2 moved the application. She sought copies of certain personal documents such as residential proof, self owned Property papers, Pan Card, etc. These documents according to the petitioner, are not required for getting admission in a primary

school. He opposed this application also because he says that by utilizing copies of such documents, respondent No.2 would strengthen her case for maintenance etc. Providing these documents would cause prejudice to him and undue advantage to respondent No.2-wife. The learned Magistrate despite of opposition allowed the application. The question before me is whether the order would cause serious prejudice to the petitioner. The answer is in negative. No doubt the documents which are sought by respondent No.2 can be utilized by her in some other proceedings which would be filed against the petitioner but this should not cause any prejudice to the petitioner. These documents are genuine and at appropriate stage such documents are required for deciding issues between the parties. Keeping these documents away from the opponent would amount to keeping these documents away from the Court. After all respondent No.2 is still the wife of the petitioner and she is entitled to know details about the petitioner. These documents would certainly provided her more information about the petitioner. In my view, respondent No.2 atleast as a wife is entitled to all these details.

2. The Petition therefore stands dismissed.

(A.V.NIRGUDE, J.)