

12

\$~2&3.

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 299/2017**

MINAKSHI SAHLOT

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. Kapil Gupta, Advocate.

versus

GOURAV CHOUDHARY

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Rahul Pandey & Mr. Ranjan Roy,
Advocates.

FAO(OS) 329/2016

MINAKSHI SAHLOT

..... Appellant

Through Mr. Kapil Gupta, Advocate.

versus

GOURAV CHOUDHARY

..... Respondent

Through Mr. Rahul Pandey & Mr. Ranjan Roy,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER

27.07.2017


%

The respondent has filed the affidavit. We have some reservations on the averments made in the affidavit for it seeks to go beyond what was required to be stated on oath in terms of order dated 5th July, 2017. Nevertheless, the relevant papers relating to the judgment passed by the Supreme Court of the State of New York have been placed on record.

2. Learned counsel for the appellant states that without prejudice to

rights and contentions of the appellant, they have already initiated proceedings before the Family Court under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 as also under the Domestic Violence Act, 2005. He states that the appellant may also initiate other proceedings to protect her rights and interests. He submits that the interim order passed on 27th April, 2017 directing that the respondent would not marry till the next date of hearing may be extended for a period of two months to enable the appellant to take appropriate steps. He otherwise accepts that the appeal is infructuous. Counsel for the respondent states that he has no objection to the extent of extension of interim order for a period of two months. He, however, states that the respondent will contest any prayer for extension or grant of stay before the judicial forum, which the appellant may approach.

3. The appeal is disposed of in view of the statement made by the counsel for the parties and noticing the issue and contentions have become infructuous. The contempt proceedings are also disposed of in view of the statement made. The question of law is left open.


SANJIV KHANNA, J.


NAVIN CHAWLA, J.

JULY 27, 2017
VKR.

Disposed of Case 1

Final order MA - 645/17 (9/5/17) 340 (MC)
Order 26500/17 (Kamrup) (10/3/17)