



\$~36 and 37

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CONT.CAS(C) 1323/2024, CM APPL. 48311/2024, CM APPL.
50392/2024

VISHAL VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Udit Gupta, Ms. Nidhi
Malhotra, Advs. alongwith the
respondent

versus

TWINKLE VINAYAK

.....Respondent

Through: Dr. Swati Jindal Garg, Adv.

37

+ CONT.CAS(C) 207/2024

VISHAL VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Udit Gupta, Ms. Nidhi
Malhotra, Advs. alongwith the
respondent

versus

TWINKLE VINAYAK

.....Respondent

Through: Dr. Swati Jindal Garg, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

04.12.2025

%

1. The present petitions in view of the order dated 12.08.2025 passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 18175/2024 entitled '*Twinkle Vinayak vs. Vishal Verma & Ors.*', also



inter se the very same parties herein, are not maintainable, especially, since the Hon'ble Supreme Court after considering the submissions made by the parties as also factual matrix involved therein, has categorically observed that it does not wish to curtail the visiting rights that have been granted to the father by the High Court. The relevant extract whereof, for the sake of convenience, is reproduced herein as under:-

“11. Accordingly, we do not deem it that it is necessary or proper for us to adjudicate anything further here in exercise of powers under Article 136 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, we dispose of this petition leaving the parties free to approach either the Family Court or the Single Judge of the High Court for any request they may intend to make in respect of the arrangement that has been made by the High Court in the impugned order as modified vide interim orders passed by this Court from time to time. It is open for the mother to make a prayer for leaving the Country to the Single Judge or the Family Court. At the same time, we do not wish to curtail the visiting rights that have been granted to the father by the High Court. The child shall keep visiting the father twice a month from Friday afternoon, after school, till Saturday evening upto 05:00 p.m. subject to any further arrangement that is made by the Family Court or the Single Judge.

12. The interim arrangements made by this Court ceases to operate and stand merged in this final order.”

2. In light of the aforesaid, since both the petitions were filed before the passing of the aforesaid order, and wherein the issue *qua* visitation rights has already been settled by the Hon'ble Supreme Court *vide* order dated 12.08.2025, there is nothing remaining therein.

3. Accordingly, the present petitions having become infructuous are liable to be disposed of.



4. As such, the present petitions stand disposed of.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.

DECEMBER 04, 2025/Ab