skt

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 483 OF 2026
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 3240 OF 2026

Pramod Jagannath Darade …Applicant

Vs.

1. Mrs. Vidya Pramod Darade
@ Vidya Vishwanath Khedkar
2. Jagannath Mukundrao Darade
3. Anusaya Jagannath Darade
4. Jayshri Prashant Darade
5. Prashant Jagannath Darade
6. The State of Maharashtra …Respondents

Ms. Ashwini B. Jadhav, for the Applicant.
Mr. Vivek V. Salunkhe, for the Respondent No.1.
Ms. M.R. Tidke, APP for the Respondent No.6-State.

CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.
DATE : 16th OCTOBER, 2026

P. C.:

1. Heard Ms. Ashwini Jadhav, learned counsel appearing for the Applicant and Mr. Salunkhe, learned counsel appearing for the Respondent No.1.

2. By this Criminal Revision Application, the challenge is to the legality and validity of order dated 29th July 2026 passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Pune in PWDVA Application No. 22 of 2026. By the impugned order, delay of 146 days in filing

the appeal challenging the judgment and order dated 15th October 2025 passed by learned J.M.F.C., Pune in PWDVA Application No. 847 of 2021, is rejected.

3. It is the submission of Ms. Jadhav, learned counsel appearing for the Applicant that the Applicant was unaware that the judgment had been passed and, therefore, there is some delay in filing the appeal. She submits that immediately upon coming to know about the judgment passed by the learned J.M.F.C., steps were taken to file the appeal.

4. On the other hand, Mr. Salunkhe, learned counsel appearing for Respondent No. 1 submits that the Applicant has made a false statement regarding his salary by stating that he is working as a Sales Representative in a medical shop and earning a salary of Rs.12,000/- per month. He submits that Respondent No. 1 filed an application under Section 91 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, pursuant to which notice was issued to the Applicant's employer. It transpired that the Applicant is working in a multinational company and earning a salary of Rs.1,77,000/- per month. He, therefore, submits that the application be dismissed.

skt

5. However, Ms. Jadhav, learned counsel appearing for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is willing to pay substantial costs to compensate Respondent No. 1 for any hardship that may be caused. Accordingly, she tenders a demand draft of Rs.5,00,000/- issued in the name of Registrar, High Court, Appellate Side towards costs.

6. In view of the payment of costs of Rs. 5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only), Mr. Salunkhe, learned counsel of Respondent No.1, on instructions, without prejudice to the Respondent No.1's rights and contentions on merits, including those concerning the arrears of maintenance, states that the impugned order be quashed and set aside, by consent.

7. Accordingly, by consent of the Applicant and Respondent No.1, who is the contesting Respondent, the following order is passed :-

ORDER

i. The order dated 29th July 2026 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Pune, in PWDVA Application No. 22 of 2026, seeking condonation of delay in filing an appeal

skt

challenging the judgment and order dated 15th October 2025 passed by the learned J.M.F.C., Pune in PWDVA Application No. 847 of 2021, is quashed and set aside and the said application bearing PWDVA Application No. 22 of 2026 is allowed, subject to payment of costs of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only) to the Respondent No. 1-Vidya Pramod Darade @ Vidya Vishwanath Khedkar.

ii. Ms. Jadhav, learned counsel appearing for the Applicant states that the Applicant shall deposit said demand draft of Rs.5,00,000/-(Rupees Five Lakhs only) with the Registrar, Appellate Side, High Court of Bombay, within a period of one week.

iii. The registry to pay the said amount to the Respondent No. 1-Mrs. Vidya Pramod Darade @ Vidya Vishwanath Khedkar.

iv. It is clarified that said payment of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only) towards costs shall have no bearing on the arrears of maintenance.

v. All contentions of both the parties on merits are expressly kept open.

skt

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Application, is disposed of in the above terms.

9. In view of disposal of the Criminal Revision Application, nothing survives in the Interim Application and the same also stands disposed of.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]