

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.173 OF 2025**

Kounal Radheshyam Bansal	...Petitioner
<i>Versus</i>	
Shradha Kunal Bansal	...Respondent

**WITH
SUO MOTU CONTEMPT PETITION NO.16 OF 2025**

High Court On Its Own Motion	...Petitioner
<i>Versus</i>	
Kounal Radheshyam Bansal	...Respondent

Mr. Kounal Radheshyam Bansal, the Petitioner in WP/173/2025 and the Respondent in SMCP/16/2025, present in-person.
Mr. Bhalchandra Patwardhan i/b. Ms. Bhagyashree Patwardhan, for the Respondent WP/173/2025.

**CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.
DATED : 22nd DECEMBER 2025**

PC:-

1. The conduct of the Petitioner-Kounal Radheshyam Bansal, as noted in earlier orders shows that the Petitioner has no regard for the institution of the Court.
2. A statement has been made by the Petitioner before the learned Family Court that he would pay the maintenance to the minor daughter from the date of separation and accordingly, the

learned Family Court passed the order. Thereafter, the Petitioner changed the Advocate and another Advocate has appeared and the application has been filed under the pretext of Speaking to Minutes. The learned Family Court has dismissed said application by specifically recording that as the Petitioner has agreed to make payment of maintenance for the minor daughter at the rate of Rs.20,000/- per month from the date of separation, the order has been passed. The said orders have been challenged by filing Writ Petition No.713 of 2025.

3. On 7th November 2025, Mr. Shah, learned Advocate, at that time appearing for the Petitioner, on instructions of the Petitioner, who was personally present in the Court made the statement that the arrears of the maintenance as per the order dated 11th June 2024 passed by the learned Family Court, Pune would be deposited in this Court on or before 21st November 2025 and the said statement was accepted as undertaking given to this Court.

4. Thereafter, the same *modus operandi* as followed before the learned Judge of the Family Court has been followed by the Petitioner. On the next date i.e. on 28th November 2025, the learned Advocate who has made statement on instructions of the Petitioner

has not appeared in the matter and even the learned Advocate on record has also not appeared and on 28th November 2025, Mr. Kounal Bansal, the Petitioner appeared in-person and made statement to comply with order dated 7th November 2025 by next date i.e. by 2nd December 2025 and the said statement is accepted as undertaking given to the Court.

5. However, thereafter, various applications and affidavits dated 1st December 2025 filed by the Petitioner clearly showing that an attempt has been made to browbeat this Court so that this Court refrains from taking up the matter. Therefore, this Court by passing detailed order dated 2nd December 2025 has issued notice to the Petitioner-Kounal Radheshyam Bansal, under Rule 9 of the Contempt of Courts (Bombay High Court) Rules, 1992.

6. On 2nd December 2025, Mr. Chinmay Patil, learned Advocate who was appearing earlier has made statement that the Petitioner has specifically informed him that he should not appear in the matter and that a new Advocate would appear, however, instead of that, the Petitioner is appearing in-person.

7. After reading the detailed order which this Court has passed on 2nd December 2025, the Petitioner sought withdrawal of all the

affidavits/applications dated 1st December 2025 (Page 242 to 293) filed in Writ Petition No.173 of 2025 and for that purpose, he has tendered writing dated 16th December 2025 specifically stating that he is withdrawing unconditionally all the affidavits/applications (Page 242 to 297).

8. On 16th December 2025, Mr. Kounal Bansal, the Petitioner who appears in-person again made the statement that he would comply with the undertaking given to this Court as recorded in the order dated 7th November 2025. He has stated that by 18th December 2025, Demand Draft of the concerned amount would be deposited in the registry. However, the said Demand Draft has not been deposited in the registry till date. Instead of that, today again pursis dated 22nd December 2025 (Page 356 to 362) has been filed raising various contentions.

9. Thus, it is clear that the Petitioner has not complied with the undertaking given to this Court on number of occasions. As noted herein above, the Petitioner has filed application to browbeat this Court and thereafter withdrew those applications/affidavits.

10. On many occasions, the Petitioner has made statement that he would comply with the undertaking given to this Court and till

date, he has not complied with the said undertaking given to this Court.

11. It is very clear that the Petitioner has no regard for the statements made to the Court and undertaking given to the Court. The conduct of the Petitioner shows that he has aggravated the contempt.

12. Mr. Kounal Bansal, the Petitioner, who is personally present in Court states that he will bring the said Demand Draft in compliance with the undertakings given to this Court tomorrow. The said statement of Mr. Kounal Bansal, the Petitioner is accepted as undertaking given to this Court.

13. Stand over to 23rd December 2025. To be listed first on board at 03:00 p.m.

**SONALI
MILIND
PATIL**

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]

Digitally signed by
SONALI MILIND PATIL
Date: 2025.12.22
19:02:35 +0530