

THIS TIME FOR
TENDULKAR

Sachinism: is the dreadful psychological condition of the opposition when Sachin is on the field – batting, fielding or bowling.

—Raghupathy KP, Vashi

Birth of records was a record itself, but Sachin ruined all of them

—Ankeet Jena, Kharghar

More messages, p21



This paper is free of any paid news

DNA

DAILY NEWS & ANALYSIS

DNA no longer has an edit page.

Instead, DNA gives you more expert comment and analysis, spread through the paper. For DNA, it's not just about point of view, but *points of view*

ANALYSIS

Shubhangi Khapre on Rahul Gandhi's popularity in the Congress p3

Manoj R Nair on the reformist movement of the Bohras p7

Harini Calamur on how the people, not social media, cause revolutions p15

Gwynne Dyer on the success of the Arab world's non-violent revolution p17

COUPLE ARGUES OVER DISTRIBUTION OF CUPBOARDS; COURT DISPOSES OF CONTEMPT PETITION FILED BY WIFE

What's in a divorce? Money, property, and cupboards

Menaka Rao MUMBAI

It's an unexpected twist to an oft-repeated tale. Couple decides to get divorced, goes to court, decides on the division of property and money and, hopefully, lives happily ever after. In the case of Parsi couple Ruby, 74, and Dinyar Casad, 79 (names changed to protect their privacy), their divorce's 'ever after' has been spent sorting out differences over cupboards.

The cupboards, one of which belongs to the couple's

son, were supposed to have been handed over to Ruby post the divorce. However, Dinyar, through his lawyer Vivek Kantawala said that one of them was, 'huge and immovable'.

Ruby then filed a contempt petition stating that Dinyar did not follow the court-appointed commissioner's orders regarding the two cupboards in his flat.

Stumped by the 'extremely narrow' dispute, justice Roshan Dalvi on February 3 disposed of the contempt pe-



—Ravi Jadhav

tion. Justice Dalvi also ordered Ruby to get three men to move the 'disputed' cupboards. She also said that if

the cupboard did belong to the son, he could take action under the law. "It does not give the wife any right to file

THE COURT HAS ORDERED THE WIFE TO HIRE PEOPLE TO MOVE THE DISPUTED CUPBOARDS, ONE OF WHICH IS 'HUGE' AND 'IMMOVABLE'. THE OTHER BELONGS TO THEIR SON

a contempt petition."

Ruby and Dinyar were married in March 1967 and lived in a joint family at Grant Road. Some years later, they moved to their present Byculla residence along with their children and Dinyar's mother. Dinyar was employed with a retired radio officer of a Danish shipping company and would be away for almost nine months every year.

After Dinyar's retirement in 1995, they began living separately as neighbours in two flats, sharing the same

kitchen. Later, a wall was built between the flats.

Ruby had filed a divorce petition before the high court stating that she had waited 42 years for her husband to "mend his ways". She had sought Rs1.5 crore from Dinyar, his estate, alimony, and the return of her 'bath stool', 'hair dryer', 'two tiffin carriers', among other 'valuables'.

In April 2009, the HC granted them divorce and asked Dinyar to pay her maintenance of Rs45 lakh, including property worth Rs5 lakh.