



\$~75

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 608/2025 CM APPL. 23628/2025**

**SHEKHAR SHARMA** .....Petitioner  
Through: **Ms. Koplin K. Kandhari, Adv.**

versus

**PURNIMA SHARMA** .....Respondent  
Through:

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL**

**ORDER**

%

**23.04.2025**

1. This petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of order dated 03<sup>rd</sup> February 2025 passed by this Court in **Cont. Case No. 1624/2024**.
2. The issue relates to non-compliance with the assurance given by the respondent's mother that there will be a video conference between the child and his grandmother (*petitioner's mother*) at least for 10 minutes every day, as directed in order dated 24<sup>th</sup> November 2023 in **Cont. Case No. 1698/2023**, and based on the order dated 10<sup>th</sup> October 2023 passed by the Family Court in the **HMA No. 50827/2016**.
3. Respondent-wife had stated that she would move an application before the concerned family Court in **HMA No. 50827/2016** placing her version and seeking requisite modification of the order.
4. However, the Court had directed that in the interregnum, the respondent shall ensure that the assurance given by her, as reflected in order

*This is a digitally signed order.*

*The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.*

*The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 30/04/2025 at 15:54:56*



dated 24<sup>th</sup> November 2023, shall be duly complied with and they shall permit the minor child to do VC with his grandmother for at least 10 minutes every week.

5. Counsel for petitioner states the same is still not being complied with. However, she fairly states that the matter is listed today, i.e., 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2025, before the Family Court.

6. An order dated 21<sup>st</sup> February 2025, has also been handed up to the Court, where it is noted that the Family Court has directed the wife to bring along the minor child for the purpose of disposal of the application, considering an assertion was made that the child is *16 years old*, and he is not interested in talking with his grandmother.

7. The contempt petition is, therefore, disposed of with the directions to the Family Court to decide the matter on its own merits after interacting with the child.

8. Pending applications, if any, are rendered infructuous.

9. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

**ANISH DAYAL, J**

**APRIL 23, 2025/RK/bp**