



\$~48

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

+ CONT.CAS(C) 712/2024 CM APPL. 25922/2024

CM APPL. 29462/2024

TANUJ DHAWAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

SONICA SINGHI

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Anunaya Mehta Adv Mr. Vidhan
Malik Ms. Kanika along with
Respondent.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

%

22.05.2025

1. Pursuant to the previous order of this Court dated 01st May 2025, a tabulation has been filed by both the petitioner and the respondent with respect to the scheduled visitation, along with remarks as to whether the visitation fructified or not, or the visitation failed.
2. As per the tabulation filed by petitioner, which is perused by this Court, till 15th June 2024 there were failures of visitation, and thereafter from July 2024 onwards, tabulation notes that all the visitations have been successful except one on 15th March 2025.
3. As per the respondent's table as well, which is filed along with written submissions, the visitations after 25th June 2024 have all been successful except for minor aberrations.
4. The reason for the previous failures, as informed by the counsel, is that there was a modification which was sought from the Family Court and



obtained by order dated 7th June 2024, since there was some difficulty arising in the visitation issues and the said order was passed:

13. Accordingly, it is ordered that unsupervised visitation right of the minor child is granted to the respondent on 01st and 03rd Saturday of every month from 10.00AM to 2.00PM at the residence of the respondent. Respondent is directed to pick up and drop the child from/at the residence of the petitioner on the scheduled date and time. Respondent/father is also permitted to interact with the child through video call on 02nd and 04th Saturday of every month from from 6PM to 7PM.

5. Clearly from the tabulation filed by both parties post June 2024, the visitation has been successful.

6. The respondent is present in person in the Court and states that she has no intention of denying the visitation to the father in accordance with the directions of the Court.

7. The attempt by the petitioners to press this issue, despite this data, before this Court, seems an attempt to use the pre-2024 events as yet another weapon in the matrimonial discord.

8. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of with the observations as stated above.

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

ANISH DAYAL, J

MAY 22, 2025/RK/bp

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)