



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

CIVIL APPLICATION (CAW) NO. 1940 OF 2024
IN

WRIT PETITION NO. 2659 OF 2024

(Smt. Shikha w/o Abhijit Das ..vs.. Shri Abhijit s/o Ashish Das and another)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Mr. V.M. Gadkari, Counsel for the petitioner,
Mr. V.S. Mishra, Counsel for the respondent No.1.

**CORAM : AVINASH G. GHAROTE &
ABHAY J. MANTRI, JJ.**

DATE : 10-02-2025

The petitioner has moved this application to permit her to amend the petition on the ground that some facts occurred during its pendency, and she wants to bring the said facts on record.

2. Considering the reason and no objection given by the learned Counsel for the respondent, we allow the application. The petitioner is directed to carry out the amendment forthwith and supply a copy of the amended petition to the other side.

Writ Petition No. 2659 of 2024.

Heard, the learned counsel for both the parties.

2. By this petition, the petitioner is challenging the order dated 05-07-2024 passed by the learned Judge of the Family Court, Nagpur. Thereby, the court rejects the petitioner's application for modification of the order passed below Exhibit

No.21 on 07-03-2024 regarding the respondent's visitation rights and permits him to meet his children on every 1st and 3rd Saturday in the month in the Children Complex, Family Court, Nagpur, at 1-00 p.m.

3. We have perused the impugned order. After considering the record and facts of the case, the learned Judge has observed that “*the respondent, being the father of the minor, has the right to meet his children, and the visitation rights have been granted to the respondent considering the paramount welfare of the minor children. As such, the application was rejected.*” However, the Court modified the order and permitted the respondent to meet the minors on every 1st and 3rd Saturday in the month. Thus, in our opinion, the order is well reasoned and no illegality is found in it. As against this, we do not find substance in the submission made on behalf of the petitioner that the learned Judge, Family Court, has not considered their contentions and has permitted the respondent to meet his children twice a month. Since the order passed by the learned judge of the Family Court is just and proper, no interference is required in it. Thus, the petition lacks merit; consequently, the same is dismissed.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

(AVINASH G. GHAROTE, J.)