



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH, NAGPUR.

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 489 OF 2025.

Yusuf Jangli Naurangabade

-VERSUS-

Sau.Salma Yusuf Naurangabade

Office notes, Office Memoranda of
Coram, appearances, Court's orders
or directions and Registrar's orders.

Court's or Judge's Orders

Shri V.S. Gokhale, Advocate h/f. Shri R.J. Shinde, Advocate for
the Petitioner.
Shri S.S. Shaikh, Advocate h/f. Shri R. Khan, Advocate for
Respondents.

CORAM : M.M. NERLIKAR, J.

DATE : SEPTEMBER 23, 2025.

Heard.

2. The petitioner by way of this petition
has challenged two orders – order dated 02.01.2024
passed by the Additional Sessions Judge, Darwha in
Criminal Appeal No.18/2022 and another order of
same date passed in Criminal Revision No.8/2022.

3. It is submitted that one proceeding is
filed by the Wife under Section 12 of the Domestic
Violence Act i.e. Misc. Criminal Application

No.212/2012, wherein an order is passed granting maintenance of Rs.1500/-. Thereafter, daughter of present petitioner filed separate proceeding under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure claiming maintenance and accordingly by order dated 07.04.2022, the Judicial Magistrate First Class was pleased to grant Rs.1500/- to the daughter towards maintenance.

4. It appears from the record that both these orders i.e. passed under Domestic Violence Act and Section 125 of Code of Criminal Procedure were challenged before the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Darwha by preferring separate proceedings i.e. Criminal Appeal No.18/2022 was filed challenging the order passed under Domestic Violence Act, wherein Criminal Revision No.8/2022 was filed against the order granting maintenance under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to the daughter. Orders passed in both these matter are subject matter of challenge

in the present petition.

5. Considering the parameters laid down under both the Act/Code for grant of maintenance, in my opinion both these orders cannot be challenged in one Writ Petition, and therefore, the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner was called upon whether he is ready to challenge both these orders by filing separate proceedings. In response, the learned Counsel states that appropriate orders be passed.

6. In this view of the matter, I am not inclined to entertain this petition, the same is therefore, dismissed.

JUDGE