

News

A Pune court ruled that a child in the care of a lady who doesn't love her husband is not safe.



The Court stated, "This is a fitting situation where we need to overcome the unwritten norm that a mother is the only "natural" caretaker while the father is only the "provider."

Conflict over custody

A Pune family court recently gave the father of a 10-year-old son temporary custody after noting that the woman did not seem to appreciate her husband, take care of the home, or nurture it.

Judge Ganesh Ghule declared that the child's future was not secure in her care because these ideals were like "foreign terms" to her.

"Pious duties of a wife towards her husband, nurturing the home, maintaining respect, providing emotional support in traditional and religious perspectives, managing the household diligently, communicating with kindness, creating a welcoming environment—these appear to be foreign terms to her," the Court stated.

The mother treated the father "as if he and his family is her seven generation enemy," according to the report.

"Maintaining the marriage vows, providing for her husband's physical and emotional needs, praying for him, and seeking his well-being in everything is expected, but she treated him as if he and his family were her seven-generation enemy; therefore, the future of the child is not safe in the company of such a woman," it continued.

A youngster who resided in Pune till 2022 is the subject of the custody issue. The child and his parents then relocated to Singapore, where they stayed until the mother brought the boy back to India in March 2025.

Then, in accordance with the Guardians and Wards Act, the father went to the family court to request custody of the child. He contended that the child ought to be brought back to Singapore, where he had been living and studying for almost three years, and claimed that the youngster had been illegally taken from the country while he was on a business trip.

In opposition to the plea, the mother accused the father of infidelity, **emotional abuse**, and physical violence. She maintained that the youngster wanted to stay with her, was content in Pune, and was doing well in school.

The Court came to the conclusion that the youngster was being swayed against his father and that their connection might be irreversibly harmed if he continued to hear disparaging statements about him after reviewing the information in the file.

The judge also cautioned that if custody stayed with the mother, **the child might be used as a weapon against the father.**

The mother seemed more interested in pursuing legal disputes than mending the marriage, the Court added. It further stated that although the mother expected her husband to provide financial support, she had showed no desire to make amends and instead viewed him as an enemy.

Additionally, the judge cited evidence that suggested the youngster was experiencing emotional anguish. The child was accused of writing lyrics about death.

It stated, **"We cannot ignore that a 10-year-old child allegedly wrote a lyric about the death."**

As a result, the Court declared that there was an urgent need to take the kid away from the mother. In an effort to distance the boy from his father, it was also alleged that the mother had regularly blocked the child's access to the father.

It maintained that the father would be in a better position to protect the child's interests and prospects, even if it noted that the youngster was adored in his mother's home.

The father has a high leadership role in Singapore, secure income, appropriate home, access to foreign education, and family support, according to the judgment.

The Court stated, **"This is a perfect situation when we need to breach the unwritten notion that a woman is the only "natural" caretaker while the father is only the "provider."**

The claim that the father was automatically excluded from custody due to accusations about his character or his suspected relationship with the family maid was also rejected by the court.

Given that the Singapore Family Justice Court had already ordered the father to regain custody, the Court gave the Singapore custody proceedings considerable weight.

The Court concluded that the concept of comity of courts had to be upheld because that order was not contested.