



\$~2

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

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 179/2025 and CM APPL. 1528/2025
SMT SHARMILA SINGH & ANR.Appellants
Through: Mr. V.S. Dubey, Adv.

versus

MASTER ABHIMANYU SINGHRespondent
Through: Mr. Nitin Arora, Mr Mohit
Chawla, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR

ORDER
15.12.2025

%

1. Through the present Appeal, the Appellants assail the correctness of order dated 28.08.2024 [hereinafter referred to as 'Impugned Order'] passed by the Family Court, whereby the Appellants were directed to pay maintenance *pendente lite* to the Respondent at the rate of Rs.20,000/- per month.

2. The Respondent filed an application under Sections 17 and 19 of the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance Act, 1956 seeking maintenance from his stepmother/Appellant No.1, who is in possession and control of various properties left behind by late Sh. Rahul Singh, the biological father of the Respondent. The Appellants contested the said application, whereafter, the Family Court, after taking into consideration the material placed on record, directed the Appellants to pay maintenance to the Respondent at the rate of Rs.20,000/- per month.

3. Learned counsel representing the Appellants submits that the Appellant No.1 has not inherited nine properties but has inherited only



three properties from late Sh. Rahul Singh. Out of these three properties, one is in possession of the Appellant No.1, the second is in the possession of the Respondent, whereas, the third property has been rented out at the rate of Rs.15,000/- per month.

4. This Court has heard learned counsel representing the parties.

5. A perusal of the Affidavit filed by the Appellant No.1 reflects that she is earning around Rs.15,00,000/- per annum. The Respondent claims that late Sh. Rahul Singh has left behind as many as 25 properties which are under the management and control of the Appellants.

6. Since the case is at a preliminary stage before the Family Court, the Appellants can always file an application for modification/revocation of the Impugned Order. By way of the Impugned Order, the Appellants have only been directed to pay maintenance at the rate of Rs.20,000/- per month, though the income as per the Income Tax Returns('ITRs') is nearly Rs.15,00,000/- per annum.

7. Hence, this Court finds no reason to interfere with the Impugned Order.

8. The present Appeal is accordingly dismissed. The pending application stands closed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.

DECEMBER 15, 2025

jai/hr