

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

WRIT PETITION NO. 1094 OF 2017

Shekhar Laxman Sonawane

...Petitioner

Versus

Prabhavati Shekhar Sonawane

Alias Prabhavati Vitthal Kamble

...Respondent

None present for the Petitioner.

CORAM : M. S. SONAK, J.

DATE : 06th DECEMBER 2017

P.C.

1. Neither the petitioner nor his advocate are present.
2. The challenge in this petition is to the order dated 02-08-2016 by which the Family Court, has dismissed the petitioner's application for review of the order by which interim maintenance came to be granted to the respondent-wife.
3. Upon perusal of the record it appears that review was applied for on the ground that the respondent-wife is working in the University of Pune and this fact was suppressed by the respondent-wife.

4. The Family Court, has dealt with this contention and held that there is no material on record to suggest that the respondent-wife was indeed an employee of the University of Pune. The Family Court had issued summon to Dr.Rohini Sahani, Head of the Department of the Economics, University of Pune. She filed her reply and stated that the respondent-wife is not an employee of University of Pune under some pseudo name of Latika Chavan. The reply is a part of record in which, it is denied that the respondent-wife is employee of the University of Pune. There is reference to some hand writing experts report.

5. The parameters of the review jurisdiction are quite narrow. The Family Court has held that no case has been made out for the exercise of review jurisdiction. There is neither any error of jurisdiction nor any perversity involved. Accordingly, this petition is liable to be dismissed and it is hereby dismissed.

6. The reason why this petition is dismissed, is because there are several instances noted where parties file petitions but do not pursue the same with the diligence. Further, on the ground of such pendency, the orders for payment of interim maintenance or otherwise, are routinely disobeyed. Accordingly, record was

perused and since, there was no merit found in the petition or no infirmity found in the impugned order, this petition is dismissed.

7. The petition is dismissed. There shall be no order as to costs.

(M. S. SONAK, J.)