

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.12578 OF 2017 in
INTERIM MAINTENANCE APPLN NO.23 OF 2016
in
FAMILY COURT PETITION NO.A-1927 of 2015**

Aditya Mitthuram Prajapati Petitioner

vs

Mrs.Poonam Aditya Prajapati ... Respondent

Ms.Deepali D.Parab for Petitioner

Mr.Chetan Akerkar for Respondent.

Coram : G.S.KULKARNI, J

Date : 20 DECEMBER 2017

P.C.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. The challenge in the petition is to an order dated 28.7.2017 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, Mumbai. By the impugned order the application as filed by the respondent-wife for maintenance has been allowed with a direction to the petitioner to pay Rs.6000/- per month to the respondent-wife from the date of application i.e.18.2.2016 till the disposal of the petition.

3. Having perused the impugned order as also the

documents as placed on record, it does not appear that the amount as directed to be paid by the petitioner is unreasonable. The only contention as urged on behalf of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the respondent-wife is an MBA and therefore, she has the potential of receiving more salary. However, there is nothing placed on record to show that the respondent-wife is earning salary of more than Rs.15,000/- as recorded in the impugned order. The impugned order therefore, would not require any interference as it is passed taking into consideration the facts as placed on record on behalf of the parties. If the petitioner is of the opinion that due to changed circumstances, the impugned order requires any modification, then it would be appropriate that the petitioner is permitted to approach the Family court seeking modification of the impugned order. All contentions in that regard are kept open.

4. With the above observations, petition is disposed of without interfering with the impugned order passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court, Mumbai. No costs.

(G.S.KULKARNI, J)

RNG

3/3

8-12578.17