

Iresh

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO. 15533 OF 2024**

Venkatesh Pandharinath BodkhePetitioner

Vs.

Pragati Venkatesh Bodkhe and orsRespondents

Mr. Pandit Kasar for the petitioner

CORAM : GAURI GODSE, J.

DATE : 20th JUNE 2025

IRESH
MASHAL

Digitally signed
by IRESH
MASHAL
Date:
2025.06.21
15:09:35 +0530

ORDER:

1. This petition is filed by the respondents in an application filed under Section 25 of The Hindu Adoptions and Maintenance Act, 1956. By the impugned order, the petitioner's application for issuing summons to the Manager of Bajaj Finance Company Limited is rejected. The learned Judge has rejected the application on the ground that it is not the applicant's defence that the applicant i.e. respondents herein had taken hand loan from Bajaj Finance Company Limited. The respondents have applied for enhancement of the maintenance amount. Hence, considering the stage of the application, the learned Judge rejected the

application by observing that only to prolong the hearing of the application, the petitioner has applied for issuing witness summons.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in the affidavit of disclosure of assets and liabilities, the original applicant has not disclosed any loan account. However, the petitioner has subsequently learnt about the loan account. Hence, he has applied for issuing witness summons.

3. I have perused the papers of the petition. The arguments made on behalf of the petitioner are not supported by any pleadings. The learned Judge has therefore, rightly rejected the application for want of any pleadings for the purpose of issuing witness summons.

4. I do not see any illegality or perversity in the reasons recorded in the impugned order. It is not a fit case to exercise the discretionary jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. The petition is devoid of any merits. Hence, the petition is dismissed.

[GAURI GODSE, J.]