



\$~39

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

+ **CONT.CAS(C) 705/2024**

POONAM JAIPAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Suruchi Mittal, Advocate

versus

AMIT JAIPAL

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Seema Singh & Ms. Neha
Yadav, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER
07.04.2025

%

1. Counsel for petitioner states that one month's EMI has not been paid by the respondent to the petitioner which is refuted by the respondent's counsel.
2. Counsel for respondent states that they have duly paid the EMIs and undertakes to reimburse the petitioner, in case any EMI is outstanding.
3. Counsel for petitioner shall communicate with the counsel for respondent after checking with the bank regarding the EMI in default / remaining to be paid.
4. Details of the same shall be shared with counsel for respondent who will thereafter verify from the bank and in the event, it is found, that EMI was paid by the petitioner, reimbursement will take place within this month.
5. As regards the monthly maintenance amount of Rs.22,000/-, it is contended by the respondent's counsel that they are regularly paying the same, to which, there is no quarrel as of now, by the counsel for petitioner.
6. In this view of the matter, this contempt petition stands disposed of



with aforesaid directions.

7. Needless to state that petitioner shall be at liberty to file appropriate application for revival of the petition in case of continued infraction.
8. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

APRIL 7, 2025/sm/kp