



\$~33

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

+ **MAT.APP.(F.C.) 181/2024**

DEEPAK RELHAN

..... Appellant

Through: Mr Sachin Sangwan, Advocate along
with appellant in person.

versus

NEHA RELHAN

..... Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHAKDHER

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT BANSAL

ORDER

%

28.05.2024

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

CM APPL. 32319/2024

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

MAT.APP.(F.C.) 181/2024

2. After some arguments, counsel for the appellant/husband, on instructions from the appellant who is present in Court, says that he will move the Family Court for recall of the impugned judgment and order as compliance of the directions concerning visitation rights granted to the appellant/husband has not taken place.

3. We are informed by the counsel for the appellant/husband that the appellant/husband has sent messages to the respondent/wife that he would book



to and fro air tickets for the respondent/wife and the child, so that they could arrive at Delhi from Singapore.

4. We may note that the appellant/husband has asked for an interim custody of the child.

4.1 The Family Court has declined the request made on behalf of the appellant/husband, mainly on the ground that the girl child is only 7 years old.

5. The appeal is, thus, disposed of with liberty to the appellant/husband to move the Family Court for recall of the impugned judgment and order, on the ground of alleged failure by the respondent/wife concerning compliance with the directions referred to in paragraph 9 of the impugned judgment.

6. Needless to add, if such an application is moved, the Family Court will pass an order after giving liberty to both sides to raise their respective submissions, having regard to the relevant provisions of law.

RAJIV SHAKDHER, J

AMIT BANSAL, J

MAY 28, 2024

at

Click here to check corrigendum, if any