

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

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.686 OF 2016

Manisha M. Gawande

.... Applicant

versus

Mohan R. Gawande & Anr.

... Respondents

Mr.Satyam R. Gaud, Advocate for the Applicant.

Mrs. Anamika Malhotra, APP for the State/Respondent.

CORAM : MRS.MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.

DATE : 15th DECEMBER, 2016.

P.C. :

1. In this revision application the applicant prays that the order dated 18/11/2016 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Greater Bombay, thereby reducing the maintenance amount and cancelling the order of arrangement of alternative residence passed by the learned Magistrate are challenged. The learned counsel for the applicant/wife submits that the learned Metropolitan Magistrate ordered the respondent/husband to pay maintenance of Rs.5,000/- per month and Rs.2,000/- to son and also ordered to provide alternative accommodation within 30 days of that order dated 16/08/2016. Against this order passed under D.V. Act, appeal was preferred u/s 29 of the D.V. Act, before the

learned Sessions Judge. In the said appeal the learned Sessions Judge reduced the amount of interim maintenance from Rs.5,000/- to Rs.4,000/- for wife and from Rs.2,000/- to Rs.1,500/- for son and in lieu of separate residence directed the respondent to pay Rs.2,000/- per month towards the rent. He submitted that the said order to be stayed and matter be heard.

2. It is the first date of this application. On perusal of the order of the learned Sessions Judge dated 18/11/2016 it is found that the learned Sessions Judge has given a time bound programme of 60 days for the disposal of the main application and the original proceedings from the date of the first hearing and the parties are directed to appear and cooperate the Court. On enquiry to the learned counsel it is informed that the first date of appearance is 17/12/2016. Thus, the learned Magistrate is expected to complete the proceedings on or before 17/02/2017. However, but for winter vacation time is extended till 17/03/2017.

3. Thus, no good reason is made out to stay the order.

4. With this the application is disposed of.

(MRIDULA BHATKAR, J.)