

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

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO.165 OF 2004

LATABAI DILIP HIRE
VERSUS
DILIP DAULAT HIRE

...
Advocate for Petitioner : Shri C.T.Jadhav h/f Shri K M Nagarkar.

...

CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.

DATE :- 30th June, 2016

Per Court:

1 The learned Advocate for Respondent No.1 has not appeared despite sufficient chances. None appears for Respondent No.1 even today.

2 I have heard the submissions of the learned Advocate for the Petitioner.

3 The substantive prayer put forth by the Petitioner in terms of prayer clause (C) reads thus:-

“(C) *The impugned order passed below Exhibit 1 in petition ER No.48/2004 (now this petition i.e. ER No.48/2004 is transferred at JMFC, Vaijapur as per G.R. Dated 06.02.2004) may kindly be modified; and the learned lower Court be directed to register the said petition E.R. No.48/2004 as per the claim in the said petition, and the respondent be directed to deposit the*

amount of maintenance accordingly.”

4 While admitting this petition on 24.06.2005, this Court refused interim relief to the Petitioner.

5 When this matter was heard on 12.06.2013, it was stated that the Petitioner is challenging the order dated 12.01.2004 in E.R. No.48/2004. However, that does not appear to be the prayer in any of the four prayers put forth by the Petitioner.

6 Considering the above, this Criminal Writ Petition is rendered infructuous and is, therefore, disposed of. Rule is discharged.

7 Needless to state, the Petitioner if is entitled to resort to any available remedies in law for redressal of any grievance, she may do so if so permitted in law.

kps

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)