



Uma

IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION NO.76 OF 2025

IN

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO.2 OF 2025

NAVITA BORKAR

... APPLICANT

Versus

DIKSHA NAIK

... RESPONDENT

Mr. Sanman R. Keny, Advocate for the Applicant.

Ms. P. Tari holding for Mr. B. Sardesai, Advocate for the Respondent.

CORAM:- SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.

DATED :- 12th November, 2025

P.C.:

Vide Order dated 16.09.2025, after hearing the parties, this Court is of the opinion that the matter could be amicably settled. Hence, the parties are requested to explore the possibility of settlement. The respective parties came up with their respective proposals. The Applicant had filed the proposal with respect to the accommodation. The counter proposal was filed by the Respondent on 14.10.2025, wherein in clause 3(A), it was mentioned that the Respondent is willing to pay the Respondent towards rent for suitable alternate accommodation within the vicinity of Sancoale area.

2. Upon filing of this counter proposal the Ld. Counsel for the

Applicant had sought time to consult his client whether the accommodation in Sancoale area would be acceptable to her. Fairly, it was informed by the Ld. Counsel for the Applicant that the Applicant can consider the said proposal of a suitable alternate accommodation in the vicinity of the Sancoale area provided a decent accommodation is given. This was also informed to the Ld. Counsel appearing for the Respondent. Today, another proposal has been filed where it is proposed by the Respondent that he would offer an accommodation in Mangoor Hill at Vasco Da Gama, Goa. It is informed by the Ld. Counsel for the Applicant that this is not the same area where the Respondent had proposed earlier and that place is not suitable to her. The Ld. Counsel for the Applicant is, therefore, called upon to reconsider this proposal and inform the Court on the next date.

3. Stand over to 15.11.2025.

SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.