



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

945 MISC.CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 157 OF 2024

Pratiksha Prakash ShindeApplicant

VERSUS

Prakash Padmakar ShindeRespondent

Mr. K. N. Bhosale, Advocate for the Applicant.

CORAM : R. M. JOSHI, J.

DATE : 1st AUGUST, 2024.

PER COURT :

1. At the outset, learned counsel for the Applicant makes a statement that in view of withdrawal of PWDVA Application No. 11/2024 filed before Judicial Magistrate First Class, Pimpri, prayer clause 'B' is not pressed.

2. None appears for Respondent/husband inspite of service of notice. This indicates that he has no inclination to oppose the application. It is the contention of the Applicant that she is not employed and having no source of income. She claims that it is inconvenient for her to travel almost 200 kms from her place of residence at Pathri, Tq. Rahata to Pune. Learned counsel for Applicant submits that the law on the point of transfer of proceeding

is fairly settled to say that convenience of wife needs to be considered. According to him, the contention of the Applicant is unchallenged and hence, it is a fit case to allow the application.

3. For the reasons mentioned in the application and in view of the fact that Respondent has not opposed the application, the same is allowed in terms of prayer clause 'A'.

(R. M. JOSHI)
Judge

dyb