

ORDER BELOW EXH.NO.36, 37 & 58 IN
CIVIL MA NO.12/2025
(Abhijeet Tukaram Patil vs. Yojana Abhijeet Patil)
(CNR - MHSN170002872025)

1] All these applications are filed by the respondent seeking permission to appear before the Court through video conferencing. Perused contents in all these three applications.

2] The respondent and her Advocate are not appearing before the Court physically. According to them, the respondent and her Advocate are residents of Sangli city and therefore, they are interested in appearing in the present matter through video conferencing on each date of hearing. As issue of visiting rights to the child is involved in the matter, it is necessary to hear both sides physically. Furthermore, difficulty of the respondent and her Advocate to appear physically on a particular date can be considered and they can be accommodated, but exemption from appearing before the Court forever cannot be granted. As Advocate for the respondent has taken responsibility to represent the respondent, it is his duty to appear before the Court. Course of video conferencing cannot be adopted as a matter of right for remaining absent on each date of hearing. Therefore, all these applications deserve to be rejected. Hence, I pass the following order :-

: ORDER :

1. Applications at Exh.36, 37 and 58 are rejected with liberty to the respondent and her Advocate to seek

permission to appear before the Court through video conferencing on a particular date when they would face difficulty in appearing before the Court for reasons beyond their control.

2. Applications at Exh.36, 37 and 58 are disposed of accordingly.

Vita
dt.01.04.2026

(R.R. Bhagwat)
District Judge-1,Vita