

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

**931 FIRST APPEAL NO.1628 OF 2023
WITH CA/4713/2023 IN FA/1628/2023**

**SAYALI PANKAJ KEDARE AND OTHERS
VERSUS
SARANGDHAR SUPDU KEDARE AND OTHERS**

...

Mr. Swapnil S. Patil, Advocate for the appellants.

Mr. Vinod Patil, Advocate for respondent Nos.1 and 2.

...

CORAM : SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.

DATED : 14.07.2023

ORDER:-

1. Heard rival submissions.
2. The respondents, who are the grand parents of the minor son Sangram and minor daughter Swara of appellant No.1 Sayali, are seeking visitation right as directed by the learned District Judge-2, Bhusawal in the impugned judgment dated 31.01.2023.
3. On perusal of the impugned judgment, it appears that the learned District Judge-2, Bhusawal has granted visitation right to the present respondents as follows :

“[1] Application is partly allowed.

[2] The respondent No. 1 shall allow the applicants to see the children, i.e. respondents No. 2 and 3, physically at her place on second and fourth Sunday of every month from 11.00 a.m. to 06.00 p.m.

[3] If the applicants are not willing to meet the children at the place of the respondent No. 1 then the meeting may be arranged at some other mutually agreed place.

[4] The applicants shall also be entitled for a meet with the children through video conference for 30 minutes once a week according to the convenience of the parties.

[5] In case, the children are not available on the second or forth Sunday, then the respondent No. 1 shall intimate to the applicants in advance and in such event the applicants shall be entitled to meet the children on the next Sunday or holiday, whichever is earlier”.

4. The learned Counsel for the appellant pointed out that the appellant No.1 is not having objection about the visitation right as granted by the learned District Judge-2, Bhusawal, but she is having apprehension that the respondents may take the minor children with them as it was done by them earlier. However, the learned Counsel for the respondents submitted that the respondents are ready to visit the minor children at the place of appellant No.1 itself as directed by the learned District Judge in the impugned order. The learned Counsel for the appellants did not raise any objection in respect of such visit at the place of appellant No.1

5. Thus, in view of the statements made by learned Counsel for the rival parties, there is no need to hear the appeal on merit since the parties have agreed to act upon clause (2) of

the operative order of the impugned judgment without raising any further grievance. In view of the same, appeal alongwith the civil application stand disposed of.

(SANDIPKUMAR C. MORE, J.)