

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

**SNEHA
NITIN
CHAVAN**

Digitally signed by
SNEHA NITIN
CHAVAN

Date: 2026.06.11
19:47:03 +0530

WRIT PETITION NO. 1941 OF 2026
WITH
INTERIM APPLICATION NO. 1240 OF 2026
IN
WRIT PETITION NO. 1941 OF 2026

Suresh Namdeo Ghuge

... Petitioner/
Applicant

Versus

Sunita Suresh Ghuge And Anr.

...Respondents

Ms. Prerna Shukla a/w Jay Gala for the Petitioner/Applicant.
Ms. M.R. Tidke, APP for the Respondent/State.

CORAM : M.M. SATHAYE, J.

DATE : 11th JUNE, 2026

P.C. :

1. Heard learned counsel for the Petitioner. Perused the impugned order.
2. The Petitioner is challenging order dated 03.11.2025 passed in Criminal Revision Application no. 8 of 2025 by Additional Sessions Judge, Nashik Road by which the said Revision filed by the Petitioner-husband is rejected, thereby confirming order dated 07.02.2024 passed by Judicial Magistrate First Class, Sinnar in Criminal Miscellaneous Application No. 30 of 2018. By this order, the Magistrate had allowed application for maintenance filed by the Respondent No.1-wife. Magistrate has granted Rs. 3,000/- per month as maintenance and has also granted Rs.5,000/- towards expenses.
3. Having heard, learned counsel for the Petitioner, in essence,

the argument centers around a divorce-deed/*farkat-nama* dated 09.06.1995 under which apparently parties separated and Respondent No.1-wife accepted Rs.40,000/- as maintenance for herself and a daughter born from the marriage. Leaned counsel for the Petitioner submitted that divorce deed is executed on 09.06.1995 and the present application is filed in January, 2018, after a long period of about 23 years.

4. It is true that the Respondent No.1 has approached the Court after long period of time. But fact remains that the marriage between Petitioner and Respondent No.1 has not been dissolved by any Court of Competent jurisdiction. It further appears that the Petitioner-husband has performed second marriage and is having three children from the said wedlock.

5. The Courts below have found that the Petitioner has agricultural properties, based on 7/12 extracts, and considering minimum wages that any able bodied person can earn, the amount of Rs. 3,000/- per month has been found to be reasonable.

6. The order of maintenance passed by learned Magistrate is confirmed by the Learned Sessions Judge on the basis of material available on record. No perversity is found in the view taken by the Courts below, which is a probable view.

7. Accordingly, there is no reason to interfere, the Petition is dismissed. No order as to costs. In view of the dismissal fo the petition, pending Interim Application is also dismissed.

8. All concerned to act on duly authenticated or digitally signed copy of this order.

(M.M. SATHAYE, J.)