

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
WRIT PETITION NO.11538 OF 2025**

Vipul Jay Pratap	...Petitioner
<i>Versus</i>	
Seema Vipul Pratap And Anr	...Respondents

Mr. Vrushabh Savla (through Video Conferencing) i/b Ms. Sneha Mishra, for the Petitioner.
Mr. Bapusaheb Dahiphale, AGP, for the Respondent No.2.

**CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.
DATED : 21st NOVEMBER 2025**

PC:-

1. Heard Mr. Vrushabh Savla, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner.

2. The challenge in the Writ Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India is to the Order dated 04th September 2024 passed by a learned Judge of the Family Court No.8, Pune below Exhibit-5 in P.A. No.858 of 2019 as also order dated 24th March 2025 passed by a learned Judge Family Court No.8, Pune below Exhibit-42 in P.A. No. 858 of 2019. The said Application bearing Exhibit-5 has been filed by the Respondent–Wife seeking maintenance for herself and for the child. By order dated 04th

September 2024 an amount of Rs.5,000/- has been granted to the wife and an amount of Rs.10,000/- has been granted to the child. Thus, in aggregate Rs.15,000/- has been granted as maintenance to the wife and the child. The age of the child is 8 years. The said application bearing Exhibit-42 has been filed seeking review of the order dated 04th September 2024 and the said review application has been dismissed by the impugned order dated 24th March 2025.

3. Perusal of the record shows for last 8 years nothing has been paid by the Petitioner–Father as maintenance even for the child. Admittedly, the salary of the Petitioner-Father is Rs.95,000/- .p.m. Perusal of the record further shows that the Respondent is serving as a teacher and getting salary of 13,7500/- .p.m. The Respondent is admittedly single handedly maintaining the child.

4. It is the submission of learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner that her salary is much more and therefore, maintenance may not granted. However, it is admitted position that the Petitioner’s salary is Rs.95,000/-. It is also admitted position that nothing has been paid towards maintenance of the child by the Petitioner- Father at any point of time.

5. It is the submission of learned Counsel of the Petitioner that he has paid educational expenses. However, there is nothing on record to support the said submission.

6. As already noted herein above, the Petitioner has filed Review Application seeking review of order dated 04th September 2024 by filing an Application bearing Exhibit-42 and the same has also been rejected by the impugned order dated 24th March 2025. Nothing has been pointed out which will require review of the order dated 04th September 2024.

7. In view of the facts and circumstances, and considering the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 227 of the Constitution of India which is discretionary and equitable jurisdiction, no case is made out for interference in the impugned order.

8. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed, however with no order as to cost.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]