

[1] M.C.A.No.26/2023 (Exh.1)

CNRMHSN040004462023
Misc. Civil Appeal No.26/2023

Amol Sarjerao Sanmukh- Appellant
Vs.
Priyanka Amol Sanmukh- Respondent

ORDER BELOW EXH. 1

1] This is an appeal under section 28 of Hindu Marriage Act. The case is fixed today for hearing on Exh. 16 and for say of the appellant on application Exh. 25. Both applications filed by the respondent/wife.

2] When called appellant present in person, his advocate is absent. Respondent present in person, her advocate is present. When it was asked to the appellant as to why the say is not given? He submitted in the open court that on last date his advocate Ravi Patil was present, however this court was on leave. However, the roznama of the file shows that on 30-08-2025 appellant was present but his advocate was absent. As per the record of this case advocate Mirjha is the advocate for the appellant, but as per the statement made in open court today by the appellant now he has engaged Adv. Ravi Patil as his advocate but the vakalatnama of Adv. Ravi Patil is not on record. When asked the appellant submitted that the clerk of the Adv. Ravi Patil had given the vakalatnama to the concerned clerk of the Court but it is not

on record. When questioned to the ministerial staff of this court, it was told by the concerned clerk of the Court that no such vakalatnama is filed on record. As such the name of the Adv. Ravi Patil is not reflecting in C.I.S. This being fact it was necessary for the appellant to keep on record the vakalatnama of his new advocate. Neither the vakalatnama of the advocate is on record nor his advocate is present. Under these circumstances the court is expected to proceed further considering the nature of the litigation. But, since this is the matrimonial litigation and the appellant wants to change his advocate in view of his statement made in open court, case is adjourned as last chance to the appellant with a specific direction to keep on record the vakalatnama and appearance of the advocate he wants to engage on next date without fail. He also shall file the say to the application Exh. 25, so that on the next date both the application can be heard on merit. No adjournment will be given to the appellant on next date.

(The order is explained in marathi to the appellant present in person.)

Date : 04-09-2025.

(Aniruddha Y. Thatte.)
District Judge 2 Islampur.