

(1)

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

**REVIEW APPLICATION NO.249 OF 2017
IN
MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION NO.129 OF 2017**

Mrs. Veena w/o Swapnil Kota
@ Veena Ashok Gorantyal,
Age : 29 years, Occu. Housewife,
R/o C/o Mr Ashok Kishanrao Gorantyal,
Near Mission Hospital, Christ Church Road,
Jalna, Taluka & District – Jalna ..APPLICANT

VERSUS

Mr Swapnil s/o Pravin Kota,
Age : 27 years, Occu. Business,
R/o At 29B/1, Padmanagar,
New Pacchya Peth, Solapur,
Taluka & District Solapur ..RESPONDENT

Mr S.P. Shah, Advocate holding for Mr R.S. Dhamangaonkar, Advocate for applicant;
Mr Sudhir Hardikar, Advocate for respondent

CORAM : NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.

DATE : 7th November, 2017

ORAL ORDER:

By the present application, the applicant seeks review of the order dated 19th September, 2017, passed by this Court in Misc. Civil Application No.129 of 2017 preferred under Section 24 of the Code of Civil Procedure, seeking transfer of proceedings being Hindu Marriage Petition No.89 of 2017 from Family Court, Solapur to District Court, Jalna or the Court of Civil Judge Senior Division, Jalna, whereby this Court, while rejecting the prayer for transfer has awarded amount of Rs.25,000/- to be paid by respondent-husband towards travel and incidental expenses on each date

(2)

when applicant-wife attends the proceedings.

2. The review is sought mainly on the ground that this Court has not appreciated convenience of the applicant-wife.

3. Mr Shah, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the applicant has invited attention of this Court to the aims and objects while introducing amendment to the Hindu Marriage Act, by Amending Act of 2003. According to him, because of strained relations between the applicant and respondent, applicant is not keeping good health and it is really difficult for her to travel from Jalna to Solapur, to attend the proceedings initiated by respondent-husband.

4. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent opposed the claim.

5. This Court distinctly remembers that the amount of expenses ordered on 19th September, 2017, is after consultation with the Lawyer, who then represented the applicant.

6. Apart from above, the point that was sought to be canvassed in the review petition was never canvassed before this Court when Misc. Civil Application No.129 of 2017 was decided. Having regard to the latest view expressed by the Apex Court, in the matter of **Krishna Veni Nagam vs. Harish Nagam**, reported in **AIR 2017 SC 1345**, that the proceedings

(3)

cannot be transferred merely for asking, that too at the convenience of the applicant, who is a woman, in my opinion, no case for review is made out. Review Application fails and stands rejected.

(NITIN W. SAMBRE, J.)

amj