

Praveen Bhaginath Golhar	...	Petitioner
Vs.		
Snehal Pravin Golhar	...	Respondent

CORAM : R. G. KETKAR, J.
DATE : APRIL 12, 2017

Heard Mr. Patil, learned Counsel for petitioner at length.

3. In support of this Petition, Mr. Patil submitted that respondent-wife is highly qualified. She has done B.E. in Electronics, M.B.A. and course of Event Management. She had earlier worked for event company. He submitted that respondent, who is highly qualified, is not expected to sit idle at home and claim maintenance. He submitted that for the reasons recorded in paragraph 13, the learned trial Judge gave

liberty to the respondent-wife to file application with proper justification about her address of residence. In the event of respondent filing such application, liberty may be reserved to the petitioner to contest that application on the ground, among others that maintenance of Rs.25,000/- per month as awarded by the impugned order is sufficient and no separate order for amount towards residence be passed.

4. I have considered the submissions advanced by Mr. Patil. I have also perused the material on record. For the reasons recorded in paragraphs 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12, I do not find that the learned trial Judge has committed any error. The submission that respondent is highly qualified and therefore, is not entitled to claim maintenance was considered in paragraph 10 of the impugned order. In the impugned order, the learned trial Judge has recorded a categorical finding that the net salary of petitioner is Rs.68,458/- and accordingly awarded maintenance @ Rs.25,000/- per month having regard to the fact that respondent wife is entitled to maintenance and maintain similar life style as of her husband. Hence, Petition fails and the same is dismissed. In case the respondent files separate application in terms of the liberty granted by the trial Court, all contentions of the petitioner are kept open. Order accordingly.

(R. G. KETKAR, J.)

Minal Parab