



\$~94

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

+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 264/2025**

**KINRI DHIR & ANR.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Shivani Luthra  
Lohiya, Ms. Pranya  
Madan and Mr. Sushrut  
Sharma, Advocates.

versus

**VEER SINGH**

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Akshaya Ganpath,  
Advocate.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN**

**ORDER**

%

**28.05.2025**

**CRL.M.A. 17046/2025 (Exemption)**

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

**CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 264/2025**

3. The present petition is filed against the order dated 17.05.2025 passed by the learned Family Court, South East District, Saket Courts, New Delhi in MT No. 317/2024, pursuant to which the petitioner's application seeking a sum of ₹1,16,500/- to meet the expenses to be incurred for the travel of Petitioner No.2, who is the child of Petitioner No.1 and the respondent, for his participation in the 38<sup>th</sup> National Under-7 Chess Championship, 2025 was rejected.
4. The learned Family Court noting that Petitioner No.1 has already been receiving a sum of ₹4,50,000/- per month towards maintenance and also noting that the issue of maintainability of



the matrimonial proceedings was yet to be decided, had rejected the prayer of the petitioners.

5. It is apparent that the respondent is involved in various matrimonial disputes with Petitioner No.1. The record as filed by the petitioners indicates that various orders have been passed from time to time pursuant to which the petitioners are receiving a sum of ₹4,50,000/- per month as maintenance. Without going into other details, the said amount, at this stage, appears to be a reasonable.

6. However, considering that the amount sought by the petitioners is only a one-time expenditure required for the participation of Petitioner No.2 in the 38th National Under-7 Chess Championship, which appears to be undisputed, this Court considers it apposite to direct the respondent to pay ₹1,16,500/- to the petitioners. However, since the respondent has not been heard in the present case and the present arrangement is only an *ad-interim* measure to meet the urgent expenditure as pleaded, the said amount is directed to be adjusted from any amount that may be payable by the respondent in future.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioner also undertakes that in case the respondent succeeds in the proceedings pending before the learned Family Court, the amount received pursuant to the present order will either be refunded within a period of 15 days of the passing of the final order or would be adjusted as the case may be.

8. Ms. Akshaya Ganpath, Advocate, appears and claims to have been authorized by the respondent to address argument in the present case. She, however, submits that she has not received any authority in writing to represent the respondent. She states



that since the learned Trial Court is still considering the maintainability of the proceedings pending before it, no order ought to be passed in the present proceedings.

9. Be that as it may, the order passed today is only an *ad-interim* measure, subject to the adjustments on the respondent succeeding before the learned Trial Court.

10. This Court, therefore, finds no impediment in directing the respondent to release a sum of ₹1,16,500/- to the petitioners. It is not pleaded by the learned counsel for the respondent that the respondent is in any financial difficulty to pay the said amount.

11. Considering the directions passed aforesaid, this Court does not consider it apposite to keep the present petition pending, since the prayer only relates to a one-time payment which as noted above is subject to further adjustments and refund after the arguments are heard by the learned Family Court.

12. The petition stands disposed of with the aforesaid directions.

**AMIT MAHAJAN, J**

**MAY 28, 2025**

*DU*