

(1)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

**CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 91 OF 2004**

Methaji Kautik Sonawane

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

Sau. Sakhubai Methaji Sonawane & ors.

..RESPONDENTS

Mr L. V. Sangit, Advocate petitioner;  
Mrs. Chaitali Kutti, Advocate holding for Mr P. N. Kutti, Advocate for  
respondent Nos. 1 to 3;  
Mr A. R. Kale, Addl. Public Prosecutor for respondent No. 4

**CORAM : N.W. SAMBRE, J.**

**DATE : 4th May, 2016**

**ORAL ORDER :**

The order dated 24<sup>th</sup> November, 2003, in Criminal Revision No. 170 of 2001, passed by the learned IInd Ad hoc Additional Sessions Judge, Jalgaon, confirming the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Jalgaon, in Criminal Application No. 284 of 2000 on 17<sup>th</sup> July, 2001, awarding maintenance of Rs. 1,000/- p.m. to respondent No.1-wife and Rs. 500/- p.m. to each of the respondent Nos. 2 and 3-children, is questioned on the ground that the petitioner has come out with the stand that respondent No. 1 is not his legally wedded wife.

2. Having heard Mr Sangit, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner for sometime, on query being made by this Court, he is unable to point out, as regards the outcome of the suit for declaration, in regard to

(2)

the status of respondent No. 1 as a wife of petitioner. Be that as may, it is required to be noted that after considering controversy, respective pleadings and keeping in mind the provisions of Section 112 of the Evidence Act, in my opinion, the order passed by learned Magistrate, does not call for any interference, as the quantum of maintenance, as is awarded, appears to be reasonable at the relevant time.

3. In the above background, writ petition fails and stands dismissed.

**(N.W. SAMBRE, J.)**

sjk