

pmw

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
REVIEW PETITION NO.5 OF 2017
IN
CIVIL APPLICATION NO.78 OF 2017
IN
FAMILY COURT APPEAL NO.216 OF 2015
IN
M.J. PETITION NO.A 2400 OF 2011

Udita Nabha	... Petitioner
Vs.	
Ranjeet Nabha	... Respondent

Ms. Sharon Patole for the Petitioner.

Mr. Jatin Sehgal a/w Kunal Vaishnav a/w Mr. Suraj Iyer a/w Debashree Mandpe i/by Ganesh & Co. for the Respondent.

**CORAM : A.S. OKA &
A.K. MENON, JJ.**

DATE : 6th JULY, 2017
[In Chamber at 2.40 pm]

P.C.

1 Heard the learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner. Almost all grounds taken in this Review Petition are the grounds which can be taken in an Appeal for challenging the order. There is no error apparent on the face of the record. In ground O and some other grounds, it is suggested that there were certain documents on record of the Family Court which were not considered by the Court. The learned

counsel appearing for the Review Petitioner concedes that the said documents were not shown to the Court at the time of hearing of the application. A litigant cannot expect the Judges to go through the voluminous record of the trial Court while deciding an interim application in Family Court Appeal. It is unfortunate that the Petitioner has taken grounds based on documents on record though those documents were admittedly not shown to the Court. The Review Petitioner was represented by a learned Senior Advocate.

2 There is no error on the face of the record. Even otherwise, there is no ground for review. Review Petition is rejected.

(A.K. MENON, J)

(A.S. OKA, J)