



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD**

MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 235 OF 2025

Trupti Manoj Sangale

..APPLICANT

VERSUS

Manoj Vishnu Sangale

..RESPONDENT

....
Ms. P.M. Kharat, Advocate h/f Mr. A.B. Shinde, Advocate for Applicant
Mr. A.T. Kanawade, Advocate for Respondent
....

**CORAM : ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.
DATE : 08th JUNE, 2026**

PER COURT :

1. The Applicant seeks to transfer the divorce proceeding bearing H.M.P. No. 210 of 2024 pending before the learned C.J.S.D., Baramati, to the learned C.J.S.D., Ahmednagar.
2. Heard learned counsel for both parties. Perused the Application and record.
3. At the outset, it appears that the Applicant/wife has moved this Application to transfer the proceeding from learned C.J.S.D., Baramati, to learned C.J.S.D., Ahmednagar, as she has no income source to travel and attend the proceeding at Baramati, which is approximately 180 kms away from Shevgaon, where she resides. It also reveals that the Applicant has a small

child; therefore, it is inconvenient for her to attend the proceeding at Baramati with the child, which indicates that she will have to endure hardship and suffering. Therefore, she urged the transfer of the proceedings.

4. Learned counsel for the Respondent, though orally strongly objected to the Application, failed to file a reply to the said Application, which leads to drawing an adverse inference that he has no grievance about the averments in the Application. It also appears from the record that mediation between the parties has failed. Therefore, I do not find substance in the objection raised by the learned counsel for the Respondent.

5. In such an eventuality, and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *N.C.V. Aishwarya Versus A. S. Saravana Karthik Sha.*, *AIR Online 2022 SC 1268*, it would be appropriate to transfer the proceeding, i.e. H.M.P. No. 210 of 2024 pending before the learned C.J.S.D., Baramati, to the learned C.J.S.D., Ahmednagar, which would not cause prejudice to the rights of the Respondent.

6. As a result, *the Miscellaneous Civil Application is allowed in terms of the prayer clause (B).*

7. Needless to clarify that the Respondent is at liberty to move an application before the concerned Court for permitting him to appear through

video conferencing in the proceeding. In such circumstances, the concerned Court may consider his application positively.

8. The Application is disposed of.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)

SSD