



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

BENCH AT AURANGABAD

933 WRIT PETITION NO. 12289 OF 2025

NIKITA AMIT AGRAWAL
VERSUS
AMIT RAMESHKUMAR AGRAWAL

...
Ms. Nikita A. Agrawal, party-in-person for Petitioner.
...

**CORAM: SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI AND
HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR, JJ.**

DATE : 7th OCTOBER, 2025

ORDER :

1. Heard the party-in-person. The Petition has been filed for following prayer:-

“B) That the Hon’ble Court may kindly direct expunction of the adverse remarks/observations contained in paragraph 2 of the Order dated 27/06/2025 passed below Exhibit 326 and in paragraph 4 of the Order dated 24/07/2025 passed below Exhibit 284 in Special Civil Suit No.146/2017, as more particularly stated in the petition, from the record of the said suit.”

2. The main contention of the petitioner is that she is resident of Ujjain, Madhya Pradesh and pursuing her matter through

Video Conferencing, personally. However, by order dated 27th June 2025, as well as by order dated 24th July 2025, the learned Civil Judge Senior Division Aurangabad, has rejected the applications, one was with remark that the petitioner had not joined the V.C. for about 40 minutes and she has wasted the valuable time of the Court and filed the application for advancing arguments. According to the petitioner, these observations are unnecessarily made when in fact though she had prayed for V.C. Link to be provided, it was not given earlier and suddenly the message was given on Google Meet that the concerned Court is inviting her to join a video call which she could not notice, but then immediately after she noticed, she tried to join but then she was not allowed and the screen shot to that effect has also been filed. Second application was for maintenance, which came to be rejected.

3. In our view, in the order dated 27th June 2025, it appears that the fact situation was mentioned from the end of the learned Judge and now the petitioner wants to place it on record from her end. That means it is the disputed fact. Of course we may say that somewhat leniency is thus required when a party-in-person is appearing and when it comes to V.C. Link, it should

be provided well in advance, so that the person can join. In view of the disputed question of facts, we may not entertain the Petition for correction of the Roznama. However, as regards the rejection of the application for maintenance, when it was pointed out to the party-in-person that it is a revisable order/appealable order, she seeks withdrawal of the Petition to pursue the available legal remedies.

4. In view of the said statement, we dispose of the Writ Petition as withdrawn, with liberty to the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum by way of appropriate proceedings. However, in Special Civil Suit No.146 of 2017, we direct the learned Civil Judge, Senior Division, Aurangabad, who has permitted the petitioner to appear through V.C., that appropriate V.C. Link be provided to the petitioner well in advance, from the given date.

[HITEN S. VENEGAVKAR]
JUDGE

[SMT. VIBHA KANKANWADI]
JUDGE

asb/OCT25