

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY,
BENCH AT AURANGABAD.

FIRST APPEAL NO. 2904 OF 2015

RAJESH NAMDEO PATIL
VERSUS
SOU. MRUNALINI RAJESH PATIL

...

Advocate for Appellant : Mr. Ajit M. Gholap.

Advocate for Respondent : Mr. N. E. Deshmukh, h/f Mr. Rajesh H. Mewara.

...

CORAM : **V. K. JADHAV, J.**

DATE : 22nd February, 2017.

ORDER:

. Heard finally with consent at admission stage.

2 The learned counsel for Appellant, on instructions, press this appeal to the extent of visitation rights. The learned counsel submits that the Appellant would like to meet his son once in a month and with this visitation permission, this appeal may be disposed of.

3 The learned counsel for Respondent / wife, on instructions, particularly the instructions from son submits that the son has conveyed that, at present he would not like to meet his father / Appellant and as per his will, wish and convenience, he would meet his father / Appellant. The learned counsel for Respondent, on instructions, further submits that the Respondent / wife has no objection if the Appellant keeps contact with his son on his cellphone

as and when occasion arises and her son, who is at the verge of majority, is at liberty to meet his father as and when he desire so.

4 In view of the above submissions, the Appellant can contact his son on his cellphone and as per his will, wish and desire to meet him for which the Respondent / wife would not have any objection. With these observations, the first appeal is disposed of. No costs.

[V. K. JADHAV, J.]

ndm