

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.9841 OF 2015

Harshad Dilip Joshi.] ... Petitioner

Versus

Mrs. Maithili Harshad Joshi.] ... Respondent

Mr. Kini i/b Mr. Mandar Limaye for Petitioner.

Mr. P. R. Arjunwadkar for Respondent.

Mrs. Maithili Harshad Joshi, Respondent present in person.

CORAM :- M. S. SONAK, J.

DATE :- OCTOBER 21, 2015

P. C. :-

1. There is no case made out to interfere with the impugned order. By the impugned order, the Family Court had issued certain witness summons mainly to bank and financial institutions. Such documents are relevant because the respondent has claimed a maintenance and in deciding the issue of maintenance, the financial position of the both the parties is a relevant factor.

2. The learned Counsel for petitioner, however, makes a grievance that vide application at Exh.162, the copy whereof is not readily available today, the petitioner has applied to the Court for direction to the respondent to produce her bank details in respect of 3

banks where she holds accounts. The learned Counsel for petitioner states that if this is the yardstick to be applied to the petitioner, then the same yardstick to be also applied to the respondent.

3. The learned Counsel for respondent, upon taking instructions from the respondent who is personally present in the Court, makes a statement that the bank details in respect of 3 accounts will be produced in the Court and copies thereof furnished to the petitioner within 15 days from today. This statement is accepted. In view of this statement, the learned Counsel for parties agree that application at Exh.162 stands disposed of.

4. The Family Court to proceed with further hearing of the matter after 15 days, so that in the meantime, the petitioner obtains the copies of bank details from the respondent.

5. Accordingly, this petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

6. All concerned to act on basis of authenticated copy of this order.

(M. S. SONAK, J.)