

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.138 OF 2026

Dnyandeo Maruti Shinde ... Petitioner

V/s.

Vandana Dnyandev Shinde ... Respondent

Ms. Jinal Sanghavi a/w Mr. Rahul D. Salvi, Advocate for the Petitioner.

Mr. M. Vijay Sawant (Through V.C.), Advocate for the Respondent.

CORAM : MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.

DATED : 25th FEBRUARY 2026

P.C.:

1. Heard Ms. Sanghavi, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner and Mr. Sawant, learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent.
2. By the present Writ Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the Petitioner is challenging the legality and validity of order dated 30th August 2024 passed by the learned Judge, 3rd Family Court, Mumbai below Exhibit-18 in Petition No.A-993-2020.
3. By the impugned order maintenance of Rs.15,000/- per month has been directed to be paid by the Petitioner to the Respondent-wife for herself and daughters.
4. It is the submission of Ms. Sanghavi, learned Counsel appearing

for the Petitioner that daughters are major about 19 and 20 years old and therefore, daughters are not entitled for the maintenance. She submits that the Petitioner's salary is about Rs.40,000/- per month and therefore, the maintenance granted is excessive. She therefore submits that the impugned order be quashed and set aside.

5. Mr. Sawant learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent submits that huge amount to the extent of about more than Rs.70,000/- has been deposited in the account of the Petitioner, although it is the contention that Petitioner's salary is Rs.40,000/- He submits that the Petitioner has not come up with the true case. He further submits that salary of the Petitioner has already been attached and details of salary produced to the learned Trial Court shows that the Petitioner is having salary of more than Rs.70,000/- per month.

6. Perusal of the record shows that two daughters of the Petitioner and Respondent are staying with the Respondent - mother. The mother is maintaining the daughters. She is doing job of stitching and she has no regular income. The mother is single handedly looking after two daughters. It is the contention of the learned Counsel appearing for the Respondent that, for that purpose Respondent has taken huge loan. The daughters are about 19 and 20 years and it is an admitted position that the daughters are taking education. The daughters are entitled for maintenance till their marriage. Admittedly the daughters are not

earning as they are taking education.

7. Perusal of the record particularly bank account statements of the Petitioner shows that apart from the salary, the Petitioner is getting huge income.

8. Thus in the facts and circumstances, no interference in the impugned order is warranted.

9. Accordingly, the Writ Petition is dismissed, however with no order as to costs.

(MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.)