

\$~18

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CM(M) 251/2019
DR SHAMSHER JAMADAGNI Petitioner
Through: Mr. Vineet Mehta, Adv.

versus

DR SAROJINI JAMADAGNI Respondent
Through: Mr. Rajpal Singh, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAJMI WAZIRI

ORDER

%

14.03.2019

The second motion between the parties is yet to be filed. It is the petitioner's contention that the *lis* has been amicably settled by way of a settlement agreement dated 19.05.2018, whereunder Rs. 24 lacs is to be paid to the respondent-mother. At the time of filing of the first motion, Rs. 12 lacs was paid to the respondent-mother. The remaining amount of Rs. 12 lacs is to be paid to her subsequently. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the second motion shall be moved within a week from today.

As per the settlement, the respondent-mother is to vacate the property, occupied by her, i.e. H. No. 1707, Sector – 7, Housing Board Colony, Kurukshetra, Haryana, within two weeks of decree of divorce. However, looking into the fact that she is residing with the petitioner's two minor children in the said house, time given to her for vacation of the premises would be four weeks from the date of grant of the decree of divorce. The keys of the aforesaid property shall be handed over to the petitioner after one month of the decree of divorce.

Additionally, the petitioner shall take out a medi-claim policy for his children for an amount of not less than Rs. 5 lacs each, duly subscribed till the younger one attains the age of 23 years. Since the respondent-mother has received all monies towards alimony, *streedhan* and other claims, the learned counsel for the respondent states that no further amounts are sought from the petitioner. Let the petitioner take out a mediclaim policy in favour of the children within two weeks from today. The application for second motion shall be filed within the same period.

Additionally, the petitioner shall pay his two daughters, pocket-money of at least Rs. 1,000/- each per month, directly into their bank accounts. Considering that the children are about 9 and 14 years of age, considering their adolescence, some expenses from their father would go a long way in keeping alive a channel for building a healthy relationship with him. In terms of the aforesaid settlement, the interaction of the children with the petitioner is not objected to by the respondent-mother. The learned counsel for the respondent-mother further submits that she would not object to further meetings of the children with the petitioner than what has been agreed to, indeed, the learned counsel states upon instructions that, if the petitioner so desires he may meet the children every weekend instead of once a month.

The petition is disposed-off in the above terms.

NAJMI WAZIRI, J

MARCH 14, 2019/kk