



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
NAGPUR BENCH : NAGPUR

CRIMINAL APPLICATION (APL) NO.1125/2025

(Mr. Rushabh S/o Siddharth Meshram and others Vs. Sau. Alisha W/o Rushabh Meshram)

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram,
appearances, Court's orders of directions
and Registrar's orders

Court's or Judge's orders

Ms. Payal S. Kaware, with Ms. Anagha A. Moon, Advocates for the applicants.

CORAM: MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.

DATED: 23.4.2026.

The applicants have filed this application to quash Criminal Case No. 36/2025, which was filed by the non-applicant before the J.M.F.C. Court, Narkhed.

2. The applicants are the husband and in-laws of the non-applicant.

3. The non-applicant filed the above case in the Narkhed Court. The applicants objected that the Narkhed Court has no jurisdiction to hear the case because the non-applicant is permanently living and working in Nagpur. She was also residing with her husband in Nagpur. She has not stated in her application how the Narkhed Court has jurisdiction.

4. The applicants raised a preliminary objection regarding jurisdiction, but the Court stated that this issue would be decided at the final stage of the case.

5. Notices were issued to the non-applicant. Although she received the notice in Nagpur, she failed to appear before the Court. For the last 7 to 8 months, despite service of notice, she has remained absent. This shows that she is not interested in contesting the matter. Therefore, the Court is constrained to proceed further without hearing her.

6. I have gone through the impugned order and Section 27 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005 which provides the jurisdiction of the Court where the applicant resides or non-applicant resides.

7. As submitted by the learned Advocate for the applicants, the non-applicant has not properly mentioned her temporary residence in the application. She has only briefly stated that she is staying at Jolwadi, Tahsil and District Nagpur, and on that basis, she claims that the Court has jurisdiction.

8. The learned Advocate for the applicants stated that the notice of this Court was served on the non-applicant at her Nagpur address, and she personally received it as per the report. The non-applicant has failed to explain why she was staying at Narkhed when she is working in a bank at Wadi and permanently residing in Nagpur with her parents. Her Aadhar Card address also shows that her parents are staying in Nagpur.

9. Since she has not clearly stated that how the Narkhed Court has jurisdiction or that she was temporarily staying at Narkhed, as required under Section 27 of the Act, the Narkhed Court has no jurisdiction. Therefore, the proceedings pending before the Narkhed Court are set aside.

10. The application is allowed in these terms and is disposed of.

(MRS. VRUSHALI V. JOSHI, J.)