

\$~12

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ CM(M) 143/2016 & C.M. Nos.15342/2016, 15343/2016, 29980/2016  
& 29981/2016  
VINEET TANEJA ..... Petitioner

Through Ms.Sima Gulati, Advocate with  
petitioner in person.

versus

RITU TANEJA ..... Respondent

Through Ms.Aakriti Dawar, Advocate with  
respondent in person.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR**

**ORDER**

% **22.11.2016**

Petitioner is aggrieved by the order dated 09.12.2015 passed by the learned Family Court Judge wherein visitation rights had been granted to the petitioner; submission is that these visitation right had been curtailed; as earlier the petitioner was also enjoying visitation rights qua the child for important hindu festivals. This has now been denied to the petitioner.

In the course of the proceedings before this Court efforts had been made for a reconciliation. Parties had also been called in chamber. The matter did not work out. This Court has been informed that proceedings under Section 18 of the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act are yet pending before the concerned Family Court.

By way of the impugned order the petitioner has been granted visitations on two alternate Saturdays for a period of two hours. The contention of the petitioner was that the respondent used to interfere

in these two hours and these two hours were reduced to a much lesser time period. His grievance is that the respondent used to not bring the child in time. She would often take the child away on the pretext of going to the washroom. The result was that the visitation period of two hours was not made effectively available to the petitioner. With the intervention of this Court efforts had been made to ensure that a full two hours period is granted in favour of the petitioner. In this context the report of the Councillor of the Family Court has also been called for. This report submits that a peaceful visitation has taken place on 17.9.2016 for a period of two hours in the children room in the presence of the Councillor. This Court has been informed by the parties that subsequent thereto also an effective two hour period visitation has been granted to the petitioner.

The impugned order will accordingly continue and the true import and spirit of the order (impugned before this Court) shall be followed by the parties. If the petitioner is keen to take the child for visitation on any important hindu festival he is permitted to move an appropriate application in this regard before the Family Court who shall deal with the application accordingly and if need be after a interaction with the child.

Learned counsel for respondent, at this stage, points out that apart from the school fee (which is a minimal amount of Rs.800/- per month), the petitioner has not been paying any maintenance for the child. This position is not in dispute. Learned counsel for petitioner at this stage, submits that the petitioner is willing and ready to pay Rs.10,000/- per month. This Court has been informed that an

application seeking maintenance is pending before the concerned Court where the proceedings under the Domestic Violence Act are pending in which the respondent-wife has moved an application seeking interim maintenance for her child.

A sum of Rs.10,000/- is granted in favour of the respondent for the maintenance of the child and this interim measure will continue being the final orders are passed on that application which is stated to be pending before the Court of Domestic Violence. This would also be without prejudice to the respective rights of the parties. This amount shall be paid on or before 7<sup>th</sup> day of each English calendar and the arrears (from the date of filing of the said application (in the Domestic Violence Act) which is stated to be of the year 2013) will be cleared within a period of four months from today.

The petitioner, at this stage submits that his another grievance is that the Teacher Parents Meeting which takes place bi-annually is not informed to the petitioner and the petitioner is not able to attend the same. This position is disputed by the respondent. Be that as it may, the respondent will inform the petitioner well in advance about the schedule of the Teacher Parents Meeting of the child.

No further orders are called for in this petition.

Petition disposed of in the above terms.

**INDERMEET KAUR, J**

**NOVEMBER 22, 2016**

**ndn**