

Bhogale

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

WRIT PETITION NO.1797 OF 2020

Pranav Rajendra Bagga .. Petitioner
vs.

Rajeev Madhukar Sule & anr. .. Respondents

Mr. Kirit J. Hakani a/w Ms. Niyati Hakani I/b. Mr. Yogesh P. Gandhi
for the Petitioner.

Mr. Sachindra B. Shetye a/w Ms. Priyanka Chavan for the
Respondent No.1.

CORAM : M.S.KARNIK, J.

DATE : MARCH 18, 2021

P.C.:-

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The order impugned by the Petitioner who was the Intervener before the Family Court is passed below Exhibit 45. The Petitioner filed an application raising an objection for calling the details of his saving bank account. The Petitioner is the Intervener in the matrimonial proceedings pending between the Respondent No.1-husband and Respondent No.2-wife. It is the contention of the Respondent No.1-husband that the Respondent No.2-wife had not disclosed the details of her single and joint bank account.

3. Learned counsel for the Petitioner-Intervener submitted that he has no concern with the matrimonial dispute between the Respondent No.1 and Respondent No.2. He has an objection to disclosing his bank account details before the Family Court at the behest of the Respondent No.1-husband. According to him when he has no concern with any of the transactions alleged by Respondent Nos.1 and in that case the Family Court ought to allowed the Application.

4. I have gone through the order passed by the Family Court. The Judge, Family Court found that the learned Advocate for the Intervener admitted that Respondent No.2-wife and the Petitioner-Intervener are having joint bank account. It is the contention of learned counsel for the Respondent No.1-husband that the Respondent No.2-wife is in a joint business with the Intervener. In this view of the matter, if the Family Court has rejected the application and observed that the details of the account will help the Family Court to ascertain the truth, I see no reason to interfere with this order.

5. Learned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that an incorrect statement has been recorded by the Family Court that the Advocate for the Intervener having admitted that the

Respondent No.2-wife and the Petitioner-Intervener are having joint bank account. If that is so, it is for the Petitioner to take appropriate steps before the concerned Court. I do not find any perversity in the impugned order so as to warrant interference.

6. The Writ Petition is rejected.

(M.S.KARNIK, J.)

Diksha
Rane
Digitally
signed by
Diksha
Rane
Date:
2021.03.18
14:23:39
+0530