

Arjun

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.9151 OF 2025

Sheetal Ravindra Nikam

...Petitioner

Versus

Ravindra Babasaheb Nikam

...Respondent

Mr. Vaibhav R Gaikwad, for the Petitioner.

Mr. Hafeezur Rahman a/w Vinaya Wagh, for the Respondent.

CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.

DATED: 01 AUGUST 2025

P.C.:

1. Heard Mr. Vaibhav Gaikwad, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner and Mr. Hafeezur Rahman, learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent.

2. It is the submission of Mr. Vaibhav Gaikwad, learned Counsel for the Petitioner that the Respondent is not paying the maintenance even for the child. To substantiate the said contention, he relies on the Order dated 11th February 2025 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Satara below Exhibit-32 in Petition No. A-172 of 2023. Mr. Hafeezur Rahman, learned Counsel for the Respondent denies the said contention.

Digitally
signed by
ARJUN
VITTHAL
KUDHEKAR
Date:
2025.08.01
19:43:18
+0530

3. Mr. Vaibhav Gaikwad, learned Counsel submits that this is a case where the Respondent-father although insisting on the access, however, he is not even ready to pay the maintenance of the child.
4. In view of the above contentions, Mr. Hafeezur Rahman, learned Counsel for the Respondent, seeks time to file Affidavit-in-Reply. Let such Affidavit-in-Reply be filed within a period of 2 weeks from today. Rejoinder, if any, be filed 2 weeks thereafter.
5. Mr. Vaibhav Gaikwad, learned Counsel for the Petitioner, on instructions of the Petitioner, states that video access of the child will be given to the Respondent-father on every Sunday in the morning between 11:00 am to 11:15 am.
6. In the facts and circumstances, the impugned Order dated 19th April 2025 shall remain stayed till next date.
7. Stand over to **4th September 2025**.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]