



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

Dr.Sabarinath Radhakrishnan

... Petitioner

Vs.

Meenakshi Sougoumar

... Respondent

PRAYER: Contempt Petition filed under Section 11 of Contempt of Courts Act to punish the respondent herein for her wilful disobedience of the order dated 06.12.2024 in C.R.P.No.2352 of 2024.

For Petitioner : Ms.R.Varalakshmi

For Respondent : Mr.D.Jayasekar

ORDER

Read this in conjunction with and in continuation of earlier proceedings made in the previous listings on 26.09.2025 and 17.10.2025, which read as follows:



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

Proceedings dated 26.09.2025:

The petitioner had filed C.R.P.No.2352 of 2024, challenging the cancellation of visitation rights of the petitioner to visit his daughter on every 1st and 3rd Saturday of a month in the Family Court itself. This Court, by the order dated 06.12.2024, considered the submissions of the petitioner and the respondent and passed the following order.

Paragraph No.11 of the order reads as follows:

“11. In view of the above, this Revision is allowed and the order dated 18.05.2023 passed in I.A.No.1334 of 2022 in G.O.P.No.22 of 2019, on the file of the Family Court, Puducherry, is set aside and the visitation right granted to the petitioner in I.A.No.702 of 2019, should be maintained as per the order, dated 30.09.2021. However, liberty is given to the parties to seek further orders, as may be required from time to time, from the Family Court, Pondicherry. The Family Court, to refer the matter for Mediation to resolve the issue between the father and mother of the child, considering the child's welfare and futures as paramount, even if any earlier such exercise got stalled. No costs. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.”

2.Thus it is clear that the respondent to bring the child to the Family Court, Puducherry on the 1st and 3rd Saturday of every month. The petitioner, admittedly, is residing and



employed in United Kingdom. For the purpose of meeting his daughter, he travelled from United Kingdom and on following dates he is present before the Family Court, Puducherry:

<i>S.No.</i>	<i>Arrival</i>	<i>Departure</i>	<i>Duration of Stay</i>
1	18.11.2024	25.12.2024	1 Month – 7 days
2	29.01.2025	05.02.2025	7 days
3	13.02.2025	18.02.2025	5 days
4	27.02.2025	04.03.2025	7 days
5	12.03.2025	18.03.2025	5 days
6	29.03.2025	05.05.2025	1 Month and 1 Week
7	17.05.2025	26.05.2025	10 days
8	05.06.2025	10.06.2025	5 days
9	19.06.2025	22.06.2025	4 days

But the respondent not bothered and violated the Court's order, hence committed contempt.

3.In support of his contention, the petitioner had also produced the adjudication from 06.10.2021 to 21.06.2025 to show that the respondent either failed to appear or did not bring the daughter or not allowing the petitioner to have a touch or any interaction with her. The purpose of visitation right is to have a touch and feel of the father with the daughter and the daughter to have love and affection of both the parents, which has been deliberately circumvented and denied by the adamant attitude of the respondent, which is in clear violation of the orders of this Court. Hence, contempt



has been committed. He further submitted that prior to filing this contempt petition, the petitioner had sent a pre-contempt notice and the same was received on 21.06.2025 but there is no reply or denial.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the respondent fairly submitted that the respondent received the pre-contempt notice but not replied. He totally denies the allegations of not appearing before the Family Court and not allowing the petitioner to have interaction with his child. It is the child, who is in fearsome of petitioner, had been clinching with the respondent/mother. He also doubts the veracity of the adjudication which was produced by the petitioner in typed set page Nos.51 to 62. He had already made a copy application before the Family Court, Puducherry and he will produce the same by next hearing and also refutes the petitioner's arrival and departure shown in para 16 i.e., between 18.11.2024 to 22.06.2025.

5.The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he will produce the Passport, Visa stamping to confirm that he was in India during the relevant period.

6.The learned counsel for the respondent submitted that the respondent, to show his bonafide, is ready to be present along with the baby by 11.10.2025 and 18.10.2025 before the Family Court, Puducherry.



7.In view of the same, the concerned Family Judge, Puducherry is directed to ensure that the petitioner visits his child without any disruption or interruption by the respondent but within the sight of the respondent and ensure that the purpose of visitation is complied with. In an abundant caution, the Family Court, Puducherry to have the entire thing recorded in CC TV camera, which is already available and preserve the same.

8.In the meanwhile, the respondent to file his counter. Post the case on 27.10.2025.

Proceedings dated 17.10.2025:

Today, the learned counsel for the respondent/wife has filed an affidavit stating that this Court by an order dated 26.09.2025, directed the respondent Dr.Meenakshi Sougoumar to appear along with child before the Family Court, Puducherry on 11.10.2025. However, no specific time slot fixed in the said order for the visitation on 11.10.2025 and 18.10.2025.

2.As per the previous visitation order passed by the Family Court in G.O.P; the visitation time was fixed between 11.00a.m and 01.00p.m. It was also informed by the counsel that during the last visit, the court staff had instructed the parties to appear along with the child in the Conference Hall



of Family Court, Puducherry from 09.00a.m., onwards. However, they were made to kept waiting till 06.00p.m in the court premises, except for 2 hours lunch break. Hence, in the interest and welfare of the child, the respondent-wife has requested to specify the visitation time.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner/husband strongly opposed the contention of the respondent-wife. The petitioner would submit that despite the orders of this Court, the respondent-wife did not allow the child to move with her father/petitioner and the respondentwife was holding the child not allowing to move around.

4.Heard both sides.

5.After hearing the parties on both sides, this Court directs the respondent/wife to bring the child to the Family Court, Puducherry, on 18.10.2025 and leave the child in the custody of her father/petitioner namely Dr.Sabarinath Radhakrishnan, from 11.00 a.m., to 1.00 p.m., The Family Court shall depute a responsible Court Staff to oversee and ensure that the baby is left free. The entire proceedings of the visitation is directed to be recorded in the CCTV camera and the report of the same shall be submitted by the Family Judge, Puducherry, so as to reach this Court on or before 26.10.2025.

6.The learned counsel is directed to communicate this



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

order to the court below.

7. Post the matter on 27.10.2025.

2.Pursuant to the order passed by this Court on 17.10.2025, a report was received from the learned Judge, Family Court, Puducherry. A scanned reproduction of the report is as follows:



WEB COPY

**Report of Child Visitations Conducted on 11.10.2025 and 18.10.2025 in
G.O.P No.22/2019**

(As per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court in CONT P No.2514 of 2025, dated 26.09.2025 and 17.10.2025)

1. Visitation on 11.10.2025

Date : 11.10.2025
Venue : Family Court Hall, Puducherry
(under CCTV surveillance)

Present :

Petitioner/Father : Dr. Sabarinath Radhakrishnan
Respondent/Mother : Meenakshi Sougoumar
Child : Baby Lakshmi, aged 6½ years
Court Officials : 1. Mrs. V. Rita Marie Rose (Sarishtadar)
2. Mrs. B. Kayalvizhi (Bench Clerk)
(Deputed as per the order of the Hon'ble Chief Judge, Puducherry vide proceedings in No.1400/CJ/PY/A/2025, dated 10.10.2025)

Preliminary Proceedings:

I humbly submit that on receipt of the Order of the Hon'ble High court of Madras dated 26.09.2025 in CONT P No.2514 of 2025, necessary arrangements were initiated for the conduct of the child visitation. A



WEB COPY

Page No.2 of 6

requisition was sent to the Hon'ble Chief Judge, Puducherry vide letter dated 09.10.2025 requesting allotment of venue and supporting staff for the said purpose.

The Hon'ble Chief Judge, vide proceedings in No.1400, dated 10.10.2025, was pleased to allot the required place and staff for conducting the visitation.

Subsequently, on the date of visitation, i.e. 11.10.2025, due to certain technical issues in the originally allotted venue, the visitation venue was changed to the Family Court Hall, Puducherry, where adequate CC TV facilities and privacy were available.

Minutes regarding the visitation held on 11.10.2025 was duly recorded and submitted herewith for information and record.

Proceedings :

I humbly submit that as per minutes dated 11.10.2025, the visitation schedule was started at 11.00 a.m., in the Family Court Hall. The interaction was conducted under the supervision of the court officials and under CC TV coverage.

When the petitioner/father tried to speak to and touch the child affectionately, the child refused to respond. The child clung tightly to her



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

WEB COPY

Page No.3 of 6

mother and even refused to turn towards her father despite repeated gentle persuasion from the supervising staff.

After observing the child's emotional state, the child's emotional state, the visitation was continued without further insistence. The session remained calm, and no disturbance occurred. At 04.25 p.m., the visitation was concluded with the consent of the petitioner/father, keeping in view the welfare and comfort of the child. A written consent to that effect was obtained and enclosed herewith.

Observation :

I humbly submit that the child appeared anxious and reluctant to interact with the petitioner/father during this session. The entire visitation was covered by the CCTV camera installed in the Family Court Hall.

H. D. L. Rb
23/10/2025
(M.D. SUMATHI)
JUDGE
FAMILY COURT(FAC)
PUDUCHERRY



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

WEB COPY

Page No.4 of 6

2. Visitation on 18.10.2025

Date : 18.10.2025
Time : 11.00 a.m. to 01.00 p.m.
Venue : Conference Hall, Utility Block, Integrated Court Complex,
Puducherry (under CCTV surveillance)

Present:

Petitioner/Father : Dr. Sabarinath Radhakrishnan
Respondent/Mother : Meenakshi Sougoumar
Child : Baby Lakshmi, aged 6½ years
Court Official : Mrs. V. Rita Marie Rose (Sarishtadar)
(Deputed as per the oral order of the Hon'ble
Chief Judge, Puducherry)

Proceedings:

I humbly submit that the visitation was conducted as per the direction of the Hon'ble High Court's order dated 17.10.2025. The respondent/mother brought the child to the Conference Hall at 11.10 a.m. The petitioner/father petitioner/father was present and he tried to interact with the child under the supervision of court staff and within the coverage of CCTV surveillance.

During the session, the Presiding Judge also personally tried to persuade the child to speak with her father, but the child refused to move



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

WEB COPY

Page No.5 of 6

away from her mother. Despite gentle efforts to comfort and encourage communication, the child remained firm in her refusal and continued to stay close to her mother.

After the Judge's further efforts, the mother convinced the child, and the child was made to sit separately beside the court staff to facilitate independent interaction. Even then, the child remained withdrawn and did not interact with her father.

The visitation was therefore continued in a calm atmosphere without compelling the child. Both parties left the premises after completion of the session at 01.00 p.m.

Observation:

The child continued to show reluctance and emotional hesitation to interaction with her father despite gentle efforts by the Presiding Judge, Family Court and the court officials. The entire visitation was conducted under CCTV coverage and no untoward incident occurred.

M. D. Sumathi
23/10/2025
(M.D. SUMATHI)
JUDGE
FAMILY COURT(FAC)
PUDUCHERRY



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

WEB COPY

Page No.6 of 6

Conclusion :

I humbly submit that both visitations held on 11.10.2025 and 18.10.2025 were conducted under CC TV surveillance and in the presence of court officials. Despite multiple efforts, the child did not voluntarily interact with the father in either session. The CCTV footage of both visitations has been downloaded and submitted to the Hon'ble High Court along with this report for kind perusal.

M.D. SUMATHI
12/10/25
(M.D. SUMATHI)
JUDGE
FAMILY COURT(FAC)
PUDUCHERRY

3.From the report, it is seen that the child was brought by the respondent to the Family Court and the petitioner was also present. Further, it is seen that the child shows some reluctance and emotional issues are involved which cannot be meddled with and no force can be exerted against the child, passage of time and sustained counselling might bring some behavioural changes on the child and it is for the Family Court to decide.

Page No.13 of 15



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

WEB COPY

4. In view of the above report, this Court finds that there is no contempt committed as alleged by the petitioner. Accordingly, the Contempt Petition stands closed.

10.11.2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order,
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
cse



WEB COPY



Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

cse

Cont.P.No.2514 of 2025

10.11.2025