

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.10938 OF 2014

Ajay Achyut Pawal .. Petitioner
-Versus-
Mrs. Kshitija Ajay Pawal & Anr. ..Respondents

Mr. Jitendra Patil for petitioner
Mr. Amit Kumar Sali for respondents

CORAM : G.S.KULKARNI, J.

DATE : 20th January 2016.

P.C.

1] Heard learned Counsel for the parties.

2] With the assistance of the learned Counsel for the parties, I have gone through the impugned order. It is an interlocutory order, in an application filed by the respondent seeking interim maintenance, during pendency of the divorce petition. By the impugned order, the learned trial Judge taking into consideration the material placed before him, has recorded a finding that the respondent wife has no source of income. Further, a finding is recorded that the plea of the petitioner that he is doing a private job is also disbelieved. It is observed that the petitioner is doing business. Considering the material placed before it, the learned

trial Judge did not accede to the request of respondent to the claim Rs.15,000/- per month by way of an interim maintenance but awarded as interim maintenance, a sum of Rs.4,000/- per month each to the wife and the son.

3] I do not find that there is any perversity or illegality in the finding recorded by trial Judge in awarding interim maintenance. The same appears to be reasonable.

4] Taking an over all view of the matter, no cause is made out in the petition to interfere with the impugned order in the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution. Petition therefore, fails and is accordingly rejected. No costs.

(G.S.KULKARNI, J)