



(1)

14-CA-10374-2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

14 CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10374 OF 2025
IN MCA/90/2025

Mr Aniruddha Chandrkant Patil

VERSUS

Mrs Sonal Anirudha Patil

...

Mr. Amarnath Shrihari Sakhare, Advocate for Applicant.

Mr. Jitendra Patil h/f Mr. M. R. Bhokarikar, Advocate for Respondent.

CORAM : KISHORE C. SANT, J.

DATE : 29th SEPTEMBER 2025.

PC :-

1. Heard the learned Advocates for the parties.
2. This application though is styled as application for restoration of the Misc. Civil Application, from the nature of the application it is seen that it is, in fact, for review of the order passed by this Court dated 12th August 2025.
3. This Court, by way of said order, transferred the matrimonial proceedings from the Court of learned Judge, Family Court at Bandra to the Court of learned Judge, Family Court at Jalgaon. It is sought to be

Ethape

contended that the date fixed was on 5th August 2025 on that day the matter did not reach. It is therefore submitted that the husband was reasonably expecting that the matter would be listed after 3-4 weeks and therefore did not immediately file vakalatnama. The matter, however, was taken up on 12th August 2025 and thus he could not get time to appear and file reply and to participate in the proceeding. Learned Advocate thus submits that order is passed without giving proper opportunity of hearing.

4. This Court finds that notice was issued by order dated 19th March 2025. He was served on 17th July 2025 by way of Whats-app as well as through E-mail by the applicant. The learned Advocate for the respondent original applicant also submits that, in fact, on the returnable date, again notice was served informing the respondent-husband that the matter would be listed on that date. It is thus seen that the husband, though there was notice, could not appear. He did not promptly appear in the matter. Now, he is trying to pose before the Court that he could not get sufficient time to participate in the proceeding.

5. From the above-stated facts, it is clear that inspite of notice, he did not appear. Though he could have appeared before 5th August 2025, no any other ground is made out. This Court does not find any merit in the application. The application deserves to be dismissed and the same is thereby dismissed. No order as to costs.

[KISHORE C. SANT, J.]