



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

WRIT PETITION NO. 386 OF 2025

**(Smt. Reena w/o Rupesh Somkuwar (before marriage – Reena Kadwaji Rokde) Vs. Shri
Rupesh s/o Haridas Somkuwar)**

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

Court's or Judge's orders.

Mr. Nikhil Dawda, Counsel for the petitioner (appointed).

.....

CORAM : ANIL L. PANSARE, J.
JANUARY 23, 2025

Having heard for some time, I do not find this case to be fit for interference with the impugned order under Article 227 of the Constitution of India for the reason that the so called subsequent development that the petitioner – wife is not working with ICICI Bank or that she has no source of income, was not put up before the trial Court and, therefore, had no occasion to consider the said plea.

2] In the circumstances, the purpose will be served if the petitioner is granted liberty to file application afresh with all relevant facts and documents before the trial Court.

3] With the above observations and liberty, the petition is dismissed.

4] Fees of the learned Counsel appointed for the petitioner be paid as per Rules.

(ANIL L. PANSARE, J.)

Sumit