


ADVOCATE /LITIGANTS DETAILS FORM

(It Must be attached with file at the time of filling)

Advocate Name (Surname first)	Adv. J. L. Andhale
Avocate Code	1512
Mobile Number	9850424207
E-Mail I.D. of Advocate	
Litigants/ Party Name	अज्ञानावर्त वि गोविंद
Litigants / Party Mobile No.	—
e-mail I.D. Litigants / Party	—
Signature of Advocate	

मा. प्रथम वर्ग न्यायदंडाधिकारी साहेब, न्यायालय, परळी वैजनाथ

कि.फौ.अ.नं. /2025.

Exh. 01

अर्जदार :- अंजनाबाई भ्र. गोविंद बडे, वय 40 वर्षे,
धंदा घरकाम रा. डाबी ता. परळी वै. जि. बीड
ह.मु. जांबवाडी, जलालपुर ता. परळी वै. जि. बीड.

विरुद्ध

गैरअर्जदार :- गोविंद पिता पंढरीनाथ बडे, वय 45 वर्षे, धंदा शेती
रा. डाबी ता. परळी वै. जि. बीड.
ह.मु. दौनापुर ता. परळी वै. जि. बीड.

प्रकरण :- 147 भारतीय नागरीक सुरक्षा संहिता प्रमाणे.
पोलिस स्टेशन :- परळी शहर

अर्जदार खालील प्रमाणे आपला अर्ज सादर करीत आहे.

1. हे की, अर्जदार व गैरअर्जदार आप-आपसात नात्याने पती पत्नी असून, त्यांचे नाते संबंध अद्याप कायम आहेत. सदर प्रकरणातील अर्जदार यांनी गैरअर्जदार यांचे विरुद्ध कलम 125 सी. आर.पी.सी. प्रमाणे पोटगी मिळणे बाबतचा अर्ज दि. 05.11.2016 मा. प्रथम वर्ग, न्यायदंडाधिकारी साहेब, न्यायालय, परळी वै. येथे दाखल केला होता ज्याचा फौ.अ.क्र. 524/2016 असा आहे. सदर प्रकरणात मा. कोर्टाने अर्जदार यांचा पोटगी मिळणे बाबतचा अर्ज दि.17.10.2018 रोजी मंजूर केलेला आहे. सदर प्रकरणातील अर्जदार यांना मा. कोर्टाने रु. 2500/- दरमहा पोटगी मंजूर केलेली आहे.

2. हे की, सदर प्रकरणातील अर्जदार यांनी गैरअर्जदार यांचे विरुद्ध कलम 128 सी. आर.पी.सी. प्रमाणे पोटगी वसुली बाबतचा अर्ज दि. 27.04.2023 रोजी दाखल केलेला असून, सदर अर्जामध्ये अर्जदाराने दि. 18.11.2021 ते दि. 08.11.2022 अशी पोटगीची वसुलीची रक्कमेची मागणी केलेली आहे व सदर अर्ज मा. न्यायालयातन प्रलंबीत आहे.



3. हे की, सदर प्रकरणातील अर्जदार यांची दि. 09.11.2022 ते 09.11.2024 रोजीपर्यंत प्रतिमहा रक्कम रु. 2500/- प्रमाणे एकुण 24 महिण्याची पोटगीची रक्कम रु. 60,000/- (अक्षरी साठ हजार रुपये) येणे बाकी आहे. म्हणून सदरचा अर्ज अर्जदार यांनी गैरअर्जदार यांचे विरुद्ध मा. न्यायालयात दाखल केलेला आहे. सदर प्रकरणातील अर्जदार यांची गैरअर्जदार यांच्याकडून येणे असलेली 24 महिण्याची पोटगी रक्कम रु. 60,000/- (अक्षरी साठ हजार रुपये) गैरअर्जदार यांचे विरुद्ध नोटीस व वॉरंट काढून वसूल करून देण्यात येणे योग्य व न्यायाचे आहे.

तरी विनंती की,

अर्ज मान्य करण्यात यावा व सदर प्रकरणातील अर्जदार यांची गैरअर्जदार यांच्याकडून 24 महिण्याची पोटगीची येणे असलेली रक्कम रु. 60,000/- (अक्षरी साठ हजार रुपये) नोटीस व वॉरंट काढून वसूल करून अर्जदारास देण्यात यावी.

दिनांक :- 07/10/2025.

अर्जदार,


 

अंजनाबाई भ्र. गोविंद बडे,

रा. डाबी ता. परळी वै. जि. बीड

ह.मु. जांबवाडी, जलालपुर ता. परळी वै. जि. बीड.

मार्फत :-



अॅड. जे.एल. आंधळे,

न्यायालय, परळी वैजनाथ.

VAKALATNAMA Exh. 02

In The Court of the मे प्रथम वर्ग न्यायाधीशजी साहेब न्यायालय परकी व. Office.

Civil Suit/Criminal Case
Appeal/Revision etc.,
M.A.C./L.A.R.

7/10/2025

अंजनाबाई

Plaintiff/Appellant
Petitioner/Complainant

VERSUS

गोविंद

Defendant/Respondent
Opponent/Accused

Claim in Suit or Charge

147 B.N.S प्रमाण.

I/We

अंजनाबाई व गोविंद वडे

वय 40 वर्ष दंड. दरभंग

श. डोगी ता. परकी व जि. करी

ह. नु. जलालपुर (जांबवाडी) ता. परकी व.

in habitant of the

in the said matter here by appoint.

डॉ. जे एम डांडके
डॉ. डी ए. उराड.
डॉ. सुप्रिया डांडके

To appear and act my/our Advocate in the said matter.


Witness my hand this

7 date of 10 2025

Witness

Client's Signature

Signature of Advocate.



Address

Prasad

जि. करी
अंजनाबाई

Prasad

Exh. 03

मे प्रथम वर्ग आयुर्वेदाधिकारी साहेब आग्राम्य
पडकी वें.
आंजनाबाई क्रि. नं. 12025

वि
गोविंद

प्रकरण - 147 B.N.S प्रमाणे
कागदपत्राची माफी

- अ. कृ कागदपत्राच्या तपशिल किनांश श्रेणी.
क) निडालाची प्रत 17/10/2018 प्रमाणे
२) आचार्य बर्ड - प्रमाणित
अर्जकाराचे

दि 7/10/2025

मार्फत
[Signature]

अर्जकार
आंजनाबाई वडे.

Double / Single

Civil / Criminal Application No. 1298 -/2025

The date on which the copy was issued for	:-	01 / 09/ 2025	₹ 21100/-	दोन हजार पंचेवीस	Two Thousand Twenty Five
The date on which the application was granted / complied	:-	01 / 10/ 2025	₹ 21100/-	ऑक्टोंबर दोन हजार पंचेवीस	Two Thousand Twenty Five
The date given to applicant for taking delivery of the copy	:-	01 / 10/ 2025	₹ 21100/-	ऑक्टोंबर दोन हजार पंचेवीस	Two Thousand Twenty Five
The date on which it was ready for delivery on	:-	01 / 10/ 2025	₹ 21100/-	ऑक्टोंबर दोन हजार पंचेवीस	Two Thousand Twenty Five
The date on which it was delivered	:-	01 / 10/ 2025	₹ 21100/-	ऑक्टोंबर दोन हजार पंचेवीस	Two Thousand Twenty Five
The Date on which the copy was applied for	:-	01 / 10/ 2025	₹ 21100/-	ऑक्टोंबर दोन हजार पंचेवीस	Two Thousand Twenty Five

Page

7 x 7

Per Page

= Rs.

49=00

This copy is issued from Civil Judge Civil Court Jr. Division, Parli - V.

Copy of Exh. No. Judgment

Crim. No. 524, 2016

Hajalakar vs. Hajalakar

Record Keeper

Assitt. Superintendent

Civil Court Jr. Division Parli - V.

Received on : 05/11/2016
Registered on : 05/11/2016
Decided on : 17/10/2018
Duration : 1 Y. 11 Ms. 12 Ds.
Exhibit No. :23.

**IN THE COURT OF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, FIRST CLASS,
PARLI VAIJNATH, AT : PARLI VAIJNATH, DIST. BEED**

(Presided over by M.J.Daule)

**Criminal Misc. Application No. 524 of 2016
CNR No. MHBI13-002284-2016**

Anjanabai w/o Govind Bade,
Age – 32 yrs., Occ. Household,
R/o. Dabi, Tal. Parli Vaijnath,
Presently residing at,
Jalalpur (Jambwadi),
Tal. Parli Vaijnath, Dist. Beed ...

APPLICANT

VERSUS

Govind s/o Pandharinath Bade,
Age – 37 yrs., Occ. Agri & sevice
R/o. Dabi, Tal. Parli Vaijnath,
Dist. Beed ...

NON-APPLICANT

**APPLICATION FOR MAINTENANCE AS PER SEC. 125 OF CODE
OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE, 1973**

Appearances

Ld. Adv. J.L. Andhale for applicant.
Application proceeded ex-parte against non-applicant.

J U D G M E N T

(Delivered on 17th October, 2018)

01) This is an application for maintenance as provided under Sec. 125 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

Applicant's case in brief as under,

02. Applicant is legally wedded wife of non-applicant. Their marriage was solemnized as per Hindu rituals at Hadbewadi, Tal. Ambajogai, Dist. Beed. All the marriage expenses are born by the parents of applicant. Not only that her parents also have gifted all the household articles in the marriage. After marriage applicant has started cohabitation with non-applicant at Dabi, Tal. Parli Vaijnath. Non-applicant has well treated the applicant for the period of five years after marriage. However, thereafter he has started causing ill-treatment to her. As the applicant is having honest intention for cohabitation, despite of ill-treatment of non-applicant, she has continued to cohabit with him. Non-applicant also has caused physical abuse to her. The relatives of applicant also has tried to give understanding to the non-applicant but all their efforts are gone in vain. Lastly, the non-applicant without any reason has beat the applicant and drew away her out of his house. Since the date of incident applicant is residing with her parents at Jalalpur (Jambwadi), Tal. Parli Vaijnath, Dist. Beed.

03. Applicant has further submitted that non-applicant without any reason has drew away her out of his house. She is unable to maintain herself. Non-applicant has not made any provision for maintenance. Non-applicant is having one acre irrigated agricultural land giving him annual income of two lakhs. Not only that non-applicant

is working as a private driver and earning Rs.10,000/-p.m. from the salary. Accordingly, non-applicant is earning rupees three lakhs annually. Hence, applicant has prayed the maintenance of Rs.5,000/- per month be awarded to her.

04. Non-applicant has failed to appear inspite of due service of notice. Accordingly application has proceeded ex-parte against him.

05. Perused the application and evidence on record. Heard Ld. Advocate for the applicant. Following points arise for my determination, findings to which with reasons are discussed as under,

<u>SR.NO.</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>FINDINGS</u>
1)	Whether applicant proves that non-applicant having sufficient means neglected and refused to maintain her?	...Yes
2)	Whether applicant is unable to maintain herself?	...Yes
3)	Whether applicant is entitled for the maintenance?	...Yes
4)	What order?	As per final order.

REASONS

06. In order to establish her case applicant Anjanabai herself deposed vide Exh.20 and has relied upon the evidence of Sonabai (Exh.No..21) who is mother of applicant. Applicant has closed her

evidence vide pursis Exh.22.

POINT No. 1 AND 2 :-

07. Applicant herself deposed vide Exh.20. In evidence applicant has reproduced the fact narrated in the application. Applicant has deposed that non-applicant is her husband. The age of their marriage is ten years. After marriage she has started cohabitation with the non-applicant. Non-applicant has well treated her for the period of five years after marriage. However, thereafter he has started ill-treatment to the applicant. Non-applicant used to insult her, caused physical and mental torture to her. In spite of alleged ill-treatment she has tried to cohabit with the non-applicant. The relatives of applicant also has tried to convince the non-applicant, that not to cause any cruelty to the applicant, but all their efforts are gone in vain. Applicant has deposed that non-applicant without any reason caused physical torture to her and drew away her out of his house. Applicant has further deposed that after alleged day of incident she is residing her with her parents. She is not having any source of income and she is unable to earn her livelihood.

08. In order to strengthen her claim applicant has further relied upon the evidence of Sonabai who is her mother. Sonabai has also deposed on the line of applicant. Sonabai in her evidence has reproduced the each and every fact narrated by the applicant.

09. At this point it is necessary to mention here that evidence adduced by the applicant has gone unchallenged as the application proceeded ex-parte against the non-applicant, accordingly there is no ground to discard the evidence of applicant. From the evidence on

record it transpire that after substantial period of marriage, applicant was subjected to cruelty at the hands of non-applicant. It has also transpired that non-applicant has drew away the applicant from his house and accordingly, the applicant has took the shelter at the house of her parent. The act narrated by the applicant in her evidence clearly shows the neglect to maintain the applicant on the part of applicant. Furthermore, applicant has deposed that presently she is residing with her parents and not able to earn her livelihood. On this point also evidence of applicant has gone unchallenged. Accordingly I hold that applicant has succeed to prove that non-applicant has neglected and refused to maintain the her and also has proved that she is unable to maintain herself. Accordingly I answer to point no. 1 and 2 in affirmative.

POINT NO.03 :-

10. In light of above discussion and my affirmative findings to point no. 1 and 2, applicant has succeed to prove that non-applicant has neglected and refused to maintain her. It has also establish that applicant is unable to maintain herself. Accordingly, she is certainly entitled for maintenance from the non-applicant. Now the next question arises what should be the amount of maintenance? Applicant has prayed that amount of Rs.5,000/-p.m. be granted to her towards maintenance. In order to support her claim she has deposed that non-applicant is having irrigated agricultural one acre land and from the said land he is earning Rs.2,00,000/- per year. Non-applicant is also working as private driver and drawing salary of Rs.10,000/- p.m. On this point Ld. Advocate for the applicant, has argued that non-applicant is earning at about three lakhs per year hence he has every capacity to

pay Rs.5,000/- p.m. towards maintenance. No doubt the evidence of applicant has gone unchallenged but on the point of quantum of maintenance mere reliance cannot be placed upon the oral evidence of applicant. Applicant has also does not produced any documents to substantiate her claim. Therefore, except the oral evidence there is nothing material on record to ascertain the income of non-applicant. Hence her demand to the full extent cannot be directly accepted.

11. No doubt the non-applicant being husband is duty bound to maintain the applicant. However, as far as amount of maintenance is concern it should not be so miger or so excessive. It should just and proper to achieve the balance. Accordingly considering the evidence on record, the standard of life of applicant, needs of woman, to my mind amount of Rs.2,500/- p.m. towards maintenance would be just and proper to meet both the ends of justice. Accordingly, I answer to point no.3 in affirmative.

POINT No.4 :-

12. In light of may affirmative findings to all the point, present application certainly deserves to be allowed. Accordingly, I pass following order,

ORDER

- 1). Application is allowed.
- 2) Non-applicant is hereby directed to pay Rs.2,500/- (Rupees Two thousand five hundred only) p.m. towards maintenance from the date of application i.e. from 05/11/2016.


Evidence of
Judgment
of

(12)


- 3) Non-applicant is directed to pay Rs.2,000/- (Rupees two thousand only) towards the costs of application to applicant.
- 4) Copy of judgment be given to the applicant free of costs.

Dictated and pronounced in open court.

Date: 17th October 2018


 (M. S. Daul)
 Judicial Magistrate, First Class,
 Parli/Vaijnath

View by
 Read by
 Date by



TRUE COPY
 Sd/-
 Assistant Superintendent
 Civil Court, J.D.
 Parli - Valdyanath,
 Dist. Beed.

11/10/25

भारत सरकार
Government of India

बडे अंजना गोविंद
Bade Anjana Govind
जन्म वर्ष / Year of Birth : 1987
स्त्री / Female



9102 9546 8556

आधार - सामान्य माणसाचा अधिकार

भारतीय विधि प्रमाणिकरण
आधार Unique Identification Authority of India

पत्ता भारती बुवा मंदिर जवळ, डाभी, टोकवाडी, टोकवाडी, बीड, महाराष्ट्र, 431530
Address: bharti buya mandir javal, dabhi, Tokwadi, Tokwadi, Beed, Maharashtra, 431530

9102 9546 8556

1847 1800 300 1847 help@uidai.gov.in www.uidai.gov.in

Verified with original

Call. Jst. 21/10/24

Assistant Superinte.
Civil Court J.D
Parli-Vaidyanatr
Dist Beed