

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO.200 OF 2019

SONALI AMIT BIDKAR
VERSUS
AMIT ASHOK BIDKAR

...
Advocate for the Applicant : Shri C.V.Bodhhe h/f Shri Gore Ravindra
Vitthal

Advocate for the Respondent : Shri Prasanna Dadpe

...

CORAM: RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.
DATE :- 18th November, 2019

Per Court:

1 The applicant/ wife prays for transferring Marriage Petition No.634/2019 from the Court of the learned Joint Civil Judge, Senior Division, Pune (Court No.15) to the learned Family Court at Aurangabad.

2 It is submitted that there are two proceedings initiated by the applicant / wife at Aurangabad and the husband attends the said two proceedings. It is further stated that she has been threatened by the husband and she fears physical injuries on account of the said threats.

3 Reliance is placed upon the following orders/ judgments :-

(a) *Sumita Singh vs. Kumar Sanjay, (2001) 10 SCC 41 :*

AIR 2002 SC 396.

(b) *Mahadevi Mehtre vs. Gopal, 2015 (5) AIR Bom. 250.*

(c) *Mona Aresh Goel vs. Aresh Satya Goel, 2000 (9) SCC
255 : AIR 2000 SCW 2652.*

- (d) *Ravinder Kaur vs. Hitinder Singh*, AIR 2000 SC 3403 (2).
- (e) *Rena Gautam vs. Vinod Gautam*, AIR 2000 SC 3405 (1).
- (f) *Soma Choudhury vs. Gourab Choudhury* (2004) 13 SCC 462.
- (g) *Anjali Ashok Sadhwani vs. Ashok Kishinchand Sadwani*, AIR 2009 SC 1374.
- (h) *Vaishali Shridhar Jagtap vs. Shridhar Vishwanath Jagtap*, AIR 2016 SC 3584.
- (i) *Reena Mehra vs. Rohit Rai Mehra*, AIR 2003 SC 1002.
- (j) *Rakhi Banerjee vs. Subhankar Mukherje*, AIR 2009 SC 928.
- (k) *T.Gayatri Devi vs. Tallepaneni Sreekanth*, 2013 (6) Bom. C.R. 119 (Supreme Court).
- (l) *Anita Balkrishna Barge vs. Balkrishna Sopan Barge*, 2011 (3) Bom. C.R. 866 (Aurangabad Bench).
- (m) *Smita Dhananjay Patil vs. Dhananjay Krishnakumar Patil*, 2013 (5) Bom.C.R. 694 (Aurangabad Bench).
- (n) *Kalpana Pankaj Rozatkar vs. Pankaj Supadu Rozatkar*, 2013 (6) Bom.C.R. 161 (Aurangabad Bench).
- (o) *Sayali Swapnil Kuber vs. Swapnil Harischandra Kuber*, 2014 (1) Mh.L.J. 584 (Nagpur Bench).

4 The learned advocate for the respondent/ husband has opposed this application and submits that the same may be rejected with

costs. It is further submitted that the applicant/ wife is harassing the husband. He is employed in a private company at Pune and cannot frequently avail of leave to travel to Aurangabad.

5 I find that the respondent/ husband is already attending two proceedings at Aurangabad. It would be counterproductive to keep one proceeding at Pune and two proceedings at Aurangabad. Instead, all the three proceedings can be placed at Aurangabad and the husband can be granted liberty to attend all the proceedings on common dates in common visits to Aurangabad considering his weekly holiday or his convenient dates for traveling to Aurangabad.

6 In view of the above, this application is allowed. Marriage Petition No.634/2019 shall stand transferred to the learned Family Court at Aurangabad.

7 It is informed that one proceeding is scheduled on 29.11.2019 before the learned Family Court at Aurangabad. The litigating sides shall, therefore, appear before the learned Family Court at Aurangabad on 29.11.2019 in the transferred petition and formal notices need not be issued. At the request of the respondent/ husband, all the proceedings at Aurangabad would be posted on common dates so that he can participate in the said proceedings in common visits.