

\$~1

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

+ **CM(M) 358/2020**

VIKAS S GUPTA

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms.Naomi Chandra and
Ms.Aprajita Budhwar, Advs.
alongwith petitioner in person.

versus

NEHA GUPTA

.... Respondent

Through: Mr.Hari Om Goyal, Adv.
alongwith respondent in person.
Mr.Shyam Kansal, father of
respondent

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER

%

08.06.2020

This hearing has been held through video conferencing.

C.M.11986/2020 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CM(M) 358/2020

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner seeking right to speak to his daughter through video call on any acceptable virtual platform till such time his application under Section 26 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 filed before the learned Family Court, Rohini is decided.
2. The learned counsel for the respondent, who appears on an advance notice alongwith respondent, submits that the respondent has no objection to such permission being granted. He submits that the petitioner has started to pay a meagre amount of Rs.15,000/- per month only with effect

from March, 2020, which in his submission is inadequate.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner shall continue to pay the sum of Rs.15,000/- per month to the respondent on or before the 7th day of each month till the application for visitation right or any application filed by the respondent seeking maintenance is decided by the learned Family Court.

4. In view of the above, it is directed that the petitioner shall be entitled to have a video conference with the child on every Wednesday and Saturday of the week between 5.30 p.m. to 6.00 p.m. Indian Standard Time. The link of video conference is to be sent by the petitioner to the respondent. To obviate any allegations against each other, the parties shall also be entitled to record such meetings.

5. The petitioner shall continue to pay a sum of Rs.15,000/- per month to the respondent, which shall be accepted by the respondent without prejudice to her rights and contentions.

6. This order shall not influence the learned Family Court in deciding the application filed by the petitioner and pending before it or any application seeking maintenance that may be filed by the respondent, in accordance with law.

7. The petition is disposed of in the above terms with no order as to cost.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

JUNE 08, 2020/Arya