



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

943 WRIT PETITION NO. 12008 OF 2025
WITH
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 10787 OF 2025 IN WP/12008/2025

SWAPNIL ANANT BICHEWAR
VERSUS
POOJA SWPANIL BICHEWAR

...
Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Shinde Tushar Chandrakant
AGP for Respondent/State : Mr. Rajdeep D. Raut
...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.
Dated : September 30, 2025

PER COURT :-

1. The petitioner challenges the order under section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act granting maintenance to the wife at the rate of Rs.10000/- p.m.
2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner or the respondent has not filed the affidavits in respect of assets and liabilities and as such, in absence of the same, the amount ought not to have been granted. The learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Aditi Alias Mithi Vs. Jitesh Sharma** reported in **2023 (7) SC 322** and submits that it was obligatory on the part of the trial court to consider the affidavits in respect of assets and liabilities of the petitioner or respondent before granting any amount.
3. Undisputedly, the petitioner himself has failed to file affidavit in respect of his assets and liabilities and as such, the trial court has passed the impugned order. Considering the same, I see no reason to interfere in

the impugned order. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioner to move appropriate application for modification of the impugned order by producing the documents in respect of assets and liabilities. If such application is moved, the trial Court to decide the same on its own merits without influenced by the observations made in this order. In the meanwhile, the petitioner is also directed pay maintenance as directed by the trial court.

4. With the above observations, writ petition is dismissed. In view of the above, pending civil applications is also disposed of.

(ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.)

ssc/