



\$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **MAT.APP.(F.C.) 274/2025, CM APPL. 46074/2025, CM**
APPL. 46075/2025 and CM APPL. 46076/2025

HENRY GARG

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Mayank Mehandru, Ms.
Charu Tandon, Mr. Avinash
Bhalla, Mr. Raghav Tandon,
Mr. Nikhil Kharaliya, Ms.
Vidushi Singh, Advs.

versus

MANSI GOYAL

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. R. N. Dubey and Mr. Adv.
Tarun Garg, Advs. along with
Respondent in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR

ORDER

%

30.07.2025

CM APPL. 46076/2025 (Delay of 81 days in filing appeal)

1. By way of the present application filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, the Applicant/Appellant seeks condonation of delay of 81 days in filing the present Appeal.

2. For the sufficient reasons as stated in the application, the delay is condoned.

3. Accordingly, the present application stands disposed of.

MAT.APP.(F.C.) 274/2025, CM APPL. 46074/2025 & CM APPL. 46075/2025

4. The present Appeal under Section 19 of the Family Courts Act, 1984 is filed against the order dated 24.03.2025 and 26.11.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court-03, Shahdara District,



Karkardooma Courts, Delhi in HMA No. 2347/2023 captioned **Henry Garg Vs. Mansi Goyal**.

5. By way of the impugned order, the Family Court had directed the Appellant to pay a separate lumpsum amount of Rs. 1,50,000/- against the *ad-interim* maintenance of Rs. 15,000/- in favour of the Respondent to meet her urgent requirements. The order was passed during the pendency of the application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 [**'HMA Act'**] for assessing the amount of maintenance *pendente lite* payable to the Respondent.

6. Admittedly, on 15.07.2025, the Respondent has been paid Rs. 3,20,000/- by the Appellant. Though, it is claimed that the Appellant has paid Rs. 3,30,000/- to the Respondent.

7. Keeping in view aforesaid position of the parties, the present Appeal is disposed of, while requesting the Family Court to dispose of the application under Section 24 of the HMA Act within a period of one month.

8. Till then, implementation of the impugned order shall be kept in abeyance.

9. Needless to state that the Family Court will proceed to decide the application under Section 24 of the HMA uninfluenced by the observation made in this Appeal.

10. Accordingly, the pending applications, if any, is disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.

JULY 30, 2025/sp/hr