



**IN THE JUDICATURE OF HIGH COURT AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

938 WRIT PETITION NO. 13923 OF 2025

Ranjeet Shesherao Gajbhare

VERSUS

Sujata Alias Pappy Ranjeet Gajbhare

...

Advocate for the Petitioner : Mr. Bhapkar Shivaji Bhimrao

...

CORAM : ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.

Dated : November 21, 2025.

PER COURT :-

1. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner. The petitioner challenges the order passed by the Family Court granting interim maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month from the date of the application, i.e., 23/07/2025. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is earning only Rs.18,000/- annually and that granting interim maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month is excessive.
2. It is observed from paragraphs 7 and 8 of the order of the Family Court that the petitioner is working as a Junior Assistant with the Zilla Parishad, Nanded. His affidavit of assets and liabilities discloses that his income is about Rs.74,598/- per month. The salary slips for April-May 2024 show that his gross salary is Rs.68,754/-, and after deductions of Rs.21,811/- and society loan instalments of Rs.19,916/-, he received a net salary of Rs.27,027/- per month. The instalment of Rs.19,916/- towards the society loan is not a compulsory deduction. Therefore, the effective salary of the petitioner is treated as Rs.47,000/- per month.
3. The petitioner also owns a plot admeasuring 1.67 R out of Survey No.102 at Waghala, Nanded. Although he has filed rent receipts showing that

he is residing in a rented house and paying rent of Rs.6,500/- per month, the 7/12 extract of Survey No.102 shows that he owns the plot situated at Waghala, which forms part of Nanded. The Family Court observed that the petitioner may be residing in rented premises only until the construction of his own house on the said plot. In this view of the matter, the Family Court assessed the petitioner's income at Rs.47,000/- per month.

4. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the deduction of Rs.20,000/- towards the society loan should have been considered. Prima facie, however, the said loan appears to be for the personal benefit of the petitioner, and no material is produced to show that it was taken for any unavoidable or legally necessary purpose.

5. The learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondents first application was rejected on technical grounds and that, after compliance, the second application came to be filed which ought not to have been accepted. This submission has no merit, as the first application was dismissed on technical grounds.

6. The learned Counsel for the petitioner further submits that the plea of adultery raised by the petitioner has not been considered by the Family Court. He states that there is a specific allegation that the respondent-wife has illicit relations. This aspect, however, is a matter of evidence and shall be considered at the appropriate stage of the trial.

7. It is submitted that the respondent may be taking benefit of

maintenance and prolonging the proceedings. However, this Court does not find merit in this contention, as the main petition was filed in the year 2020 and the order of interim maintenance has been passed only in the year 2025 , to be paid from 23/07/2025.

8. The learned Counsel for the petitioner lastly submits that the main petition is pending and prays for its expeditious disposal. Considering this request, the Family Court is directed to expedite the proceedings and dispose of the main petition within a period of one year.

9. The interim maintenance of Rs.10,000/- per month cannot be said to be excessive. This Court, therefore, finds no reason to interfere with the impugned order. The petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(ARUN R. PEDNEKER, J.)

vj gawade/-.