



\$~79 & 80

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **CRL.REV.P. 422/2022 & CRL.M.A. 13177/2022**

ANSHUMAN NARANG ..... Petitioner  
Through: Mr. Nitin Mehta and  
Mr. Arpit Rawat, Advs.

versus

RITIKA JUNEJA ..... Respondent  
Through: Mr. M. C. Dhingra,  
Mr. Gaurav Dhingra,  
Mr. Shashank Singh and  
Dr. Pradip Juneja, Advs.

+ **CRL.REV.P. 361/2023 & CRL.M.A. 8943/2023**

RITIKA JUNEJA ..... Petitioner  
Through: Mr. M. C. Dhingra,  
Mr. Gaurav Dhingra,  
Mr. Shashank Singh and  
Dr. Pradip Juneja, Advs.

versus

ANSHUMAN NARANG ..... Respondent  
Through: Mr. Nitin Mehta and  
Mr. Arpit Rawat, Advs.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN**

**ORDER**

%

**19.03.2024**

1. The present petitions are filed challenging the order dated 06.06.2022 (hereafter '**impugned order**') passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Courts, North West District, Rohini Courts, Delhi in MT No. 56690/2016 titled as *Ritika Juneja v. Anshuman Narang* and HMA Petition 1963/2017 titled as *Ansuman Narang v. Ritika Juneja*.
2. By way of CRL.REV.P. 422/2022, the petitioner / husband seeks setting aside of the impugned order passed by the learned Family Court, directing him to pay an interim maintenance amount of ₹50,000/- per month from 15.05.2015 till December



2021 and thereafter, to pay of ₹1,00,000/- per month from Jan 2022 onwards.

3. By way of CRL.REV.P. 361/2023 had the petitioner / wife seeks enhancement of interim maintenance amount awarded by the learned Family Court.

4. This Court, by order dated 13.07.2022, directed the petitioner to keep paying a sum of ₹50,000/- during the pendency of the present petition. The matter had since been heard from time to time but the arguments could not conclude.

5. The parties have a long history of litigations. On an earlier occasion, CRL.M.C. 1563/2023 and CRL. M.C. 5643/2023 were disposed of by the order dated 16.10.2023 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court. The Coordinate Bench had directed the learned Trial Court to finally dispose of the proceedings in relation to the maintenance in a time bound manner.

6. It has been informed that the matter is now listed for final arguments before the learned Trial Court.

7. The present petitions challenge the grant of interim maintenance. It is not in dispute that the order for interim maintenance is passed during the pendency of the petition filed by the aggrieved party seeking maintenance. Since the learned Family Court has now listed the matter for final arguments, this Court does not consider it apposite to pass any order in the present petitions. Any order that would be finally passed by the learned Family Court, would keep into account any amount that is paid by the husband as an interim maintenance.

8. The interim orders passed by the Courts are in aid of the final orders, which finally merge with the final orders passed by the Courts.



9. The learned counsel for the petitioner in CRL.REV.P. 422/2022 submits that there has been change in circumstances pursuant to passing of the impugned order. He submits that the petitioner has since changed his job and has not been earning salary as noted by the learned Family Court. It is, however, not denied that the said fact has been brought to the knowledge of the learned Family Court and the same would be considered by the learned Family Court while deciding the petition finally.

10. The learned counsel for the respondent/Ritika Juneja, submits that he will not insist on execution for recovery of the arrears of the interim maintenance for a period of eight weeks from date.

11. In view of the above, all interim orders are vacated with a direction to the learned Trial Court to dispose of the matter expeditiously and preferably within a period of eight weeks from date. The respondent/Ritika Juneja is directed not to insist on execution for recovery of arrears till the present order subject to the petitioner/Anshuman Narang continue paying the maintenance as directed by the learned Trial Court from the date upto the final decision. Needless to state, the amount paid upto the final decision would be adjusted from the final maintenance that may be awarded by the learned Trial Court.

12. It is made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case.

13. The petitions are disposed of in aforementioned terms.

14. Let the copy of this order be placed in both the matters.

**AMIT MAHAJAN, J**

**MARCH 19, 2024/ 'KDK'**