

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 16964 OF 2024

Manish Vinod Ringasia

...Petitioner

V/s.

Aarti Manish Ringasia Alias

Aarti Bimal Sharma

...Respondent

Sr. Adv. Ms. Neeta Karnik i/b Mr. Piyush Todkar, Advocate for the
Petitioner/Applicant.

Mr. Rahul Shelake a/w Adv. P. M. Khopkar, Advocate for the
Respondent.

CORAM : N.R. BORKAR, J.
DATE : 09.04.2026.

P.C. :

1. This petition takes exception to the order dated 13.05.2024 passed by the Family Court, Thane below Exh.7 in Petition No. A/229/2023.

2. By the order impugned, the learned Family Court has allowed the application filed by the respondent/wife under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, and directed the petitioner/husband to pay monthly maintenance at the rate of Rs. 30,000/- to the respondent/wife and Rs. 10,000/- each to the son and the daughter.

3. I have heard the learned senior counsel for the petitioner/husband and the learned counsel for the contesting respondent/wife.

4. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties are residing under the same roof. It is submitted that the petitioner is even paying the school fees of the son and daughter. It is further submitted that the petitioner is looking after the household expenses and till the date of passing of the impugned order was paying Rs.10,000 to Rs. 15,000 per month to the respondent/wife. It is submitted that the learned Family Court has ignored these facts. It is submitted that the impugned order, therefore, cannot be allowed to stand.

5. On the other hand, the learned counsel for the respondent submits that the petitioner is earning about Rs.5,00,000/- per month. It is submitted that the learned Family Court after considering all the aspects has passed the impugned order.

6. The learned counsel for the respondent has drawn my attention to the order passed by this Court dated 21.11.2025. By the said order, this Court directed the parties to file fresh affidavits

of assets and liabilities. The learned counsel for the respondent submits that, till date, the petitioner has not filed the said affidavit of assets and liabilities. It is submitted that thus the petition be dismissed.

7. In spite of the order dated 21.11.2025 passed by this Court, the petitioner has not filed the affidavit of assets and liabilities. The learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the affidavit could not be filed as the petitioner was out of India. The affidavit was to be filed by 03.01.2026. If the petitioner was out of India, then request should have been made for extension of time to file the affidavit. However, it appears that no such request is made. Apart from it, considering the income of the petitioner the quantum of maintenance granted by the Family Court appears to be very reasonable.

8. The petition is therefore dismissed.

[N.R.BORKAR, J.]