

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

MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 371 OF 2024

Mrs. Minaxi Rohit BirajdarApplicant

Versus

Mr. Rohit Bhimashankar BirajdarRespondent

....

Adv. Mihir Jadhav h/f Mr. Yogen Kakde, Mr. Shashank Shubham,
Advocate for the Applicant.

Mr. Pradip Chavan a/w Ms. Shweta Borade, Advocate for Respondent.

....

CORAM : MILIND N. JADHAV, J.

DATE : 16th AUGUST, 2024.

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Jadhav, learned Advocate for the Applicant and
Mr. Chavan, learned Advocate for the Respondent.

2. The Applicant is directed to serve a copy of the
Application on the Advocate for the Respondent. The copy is given
to him in my presence in the Court.

3. A grievance is expressed by the learned Advocate for the
Respondent that though transfer by the Applicant is sought to Pune
from the Family Court at Bandra, it is sought on the basis that the
Applicant is having her job at Pune even though the Headquarter of
her company is at Vikroli. I have impressed upon learned Advocate
for the Applicant to place on record the details about Applicant's

job profile and working at Pune and for how long she will be stationed in Pune. This is only to ensure that it should not happen in the immediate future that after she gets re-transferred back to Mumbai, she makes another application for seeking transfer of the proceedings to Mumbai.

4. Since, this is the apprehension expressed by the Advocate for the Respondent, the Applicant is directed by this Court for answer the same. Equally, Respondent shall be at liberty to file affidavit-in-reply with objections, if so desired and the same shall be considered by the Court on the next adjourned date.

5. **Stand over to 23rd August, 2024.**

(MILIND N. JADHAV, J.)