

Order below Exh. 24 in Cri.M.A 222/2021
Arpita Vs Shashikant

The application is for issuing witness summons.

2 Perused the application, say, and the record.

3 Heard both the sides.

4 The application (Exh.1) is under the provision of PWDVA, 2005.

5 The respondent has opposed by filing say.

6 The application is premised on the ground, that the applicant has denied to be working in Shalivahan Patanshetti, hospital, Jath. The documents are not available. Accordingly, Dr. Shalivahan Patanshetti be called as a witness to bring the salary certificate, and attendance sheet of the applicant.

7 The application is opposed on the ground, that the application is misconceived and made to delay the proceedings. The applicant is not working with the said hospital. Hence, the application is opposed.

8 On prima facie perusal of the record, the application is vague as to since when the applicant is working and the relevant period for bringing the alleged record. No prima facie efforts or material to suggest that the respondent made any attempts to procure the information. The application is also prima facie vague whether on what post the applicant is working and whether a record has been maintained or otherwise.

9 The applicant denied having being employed, while respondent 1 alleged employment. The parties have filed their respective affidavit of assets and liabilities. The applicant herein has not controverted the affidavit of assets and liabilities of the applicant and further the directions in para 69 and onwards in the law laid down in **Rajnish Vs Neha (2021) 2 SCC 324**. The application sans merit. Hence, the following

Order

The application stands rejected with costs.

2 Costs in the cause.

Jath
Date.16/03/2026

(Sanjay P. Bunde)
JMFC, Jath (Court No.2)