

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

**CONTEMPT PETITION NO.398 OF 2017
IN
FAMILY COURT APPEAL NO.175 OF 2009**

Manjusha Jahagirdar @ Manjusha
Abhijit Malegonkar

... Petitioner

v/s

Kedar Shrikrishna Patwardhan

... Respondent

*Mr T.D. Deshmukh for Petitioner.
None for Respondent.*

***CORAM : K.K. TATED AND
B.P. COLABAWALLA, JJ.***

DATE : 21 March, 2018.

P.C. :-

1. Heard learned counsel for Petitioner.
2. The learned counsel for Petitioner submits that, the Respondent violated terms and conditions of consent terms dated 30th November 2009, particularly clauses 3(j) and 7 which read thus :-

“3(j) The party who has custody of Gauri will solely take responsibility of financial requirements of Gauri and

will not burden the other party not having custody with the same irrespective of quantum and reason of expenses which might have to be incurred.

7. The parties hereto agree and undertake that none would claim / press for maintenance and/or any kind of monetary claim or any other claim of whatsoever nature from each other in their life time and will also not claim / press for maintenance of Gauri from party who is not in possession of her custody.”

3. The bare reading of Contempt Petition shows that the Petitioner has not placed on record any documentary evidence to show that the Respondent has violated these two terms of the Contempt Petition. Hence, Contempt Petition stands dismissed. No order as to costs.

(B.P. COLABAWALLA, J)

(K.K. TATED, J.)