

Arjun

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.1939 OF 2026

Anil Tulsiram Yadav

...Petitioner

Versus

Indu Anil Yadav & Anr.

...Respondents

ARJUN
VITTHAL
KUDHEKAR

Digitally signed by
ARJUN VITTHAL
KUDHEKAR

Date: 2026.02.24
21:29:48 +0530

Ms. Meera R. Yadav, for the Petitioner.

CORAM: MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.

DATED: 24 FEBRUARY 2026

P.C.:

1. Heard Ms. Yadav, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner.
2. By the present Writ Petition filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the Petitioner has challenged the legality and validity of the Order dated 4th July 2025 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Thane, below Exhibit-18 in Petition No. A-412/2016 (“**impugned Order**”).
3. By the impugned Order, an amount of Rs.9,000/- per month has been directed to be paid as maintenance to the wife and the son from the date of application i.e. 8th May 2024, in addition to the maintenance of Rs.6,000/- which was granted in the DV proceedings. The learned Judge of the Family Court has observed that although it is the case of the Petitioner that he is earning only Rs.25,000/- per month, his bank account shows that various amounts i.e. Rs.57,000/-, Rs.44,000/- and Rs.60,000/- have been credited.

4. Thus, in effect, the Court has observed that the Petitioner has not approached the Court with clean hands.
5. In any case, the Petitioner is a qualified person and is an Engineer.
6. Ms. Yadav, learned Counsel for the Petitioner states that at present the Petitioner is working in Kuwait.
7. Thus, in the facts and circumstances, no interference in the impugned Order is warranted.
8. Accordingly the Writ Petition is dismissed, however with no order as to costs.

[MADHAV J. JAMDAR, J.]