



\$~69

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

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 307/2025, CM APPL. 53380/2025, CM APPL. 53381/2025 and CM APPL. 53382/2025

UPASANA PINDWAL

.....Appellant

Through: Ms. Preeti Singh, Mr. Sunklan Porwal, Ms. Anuradha Anand and Ms. Sakshi Trivedi

versus

RAHUL DUTTA GUPTA

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Madhurima Ghosh, Ms Damini Chawla and Mr. Md. Jawed Iqbal Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN

SHANKAR

ORDER

%

27.08.2025

1. The present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant under Section 19 of the Family Courts Act, 1984 assailing the correctness of the Impugned Orders dated 19.07.2025 and 26.07.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge, Family Court, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi in G.P. No. 28 of 2024 captioned ***Upasana Pindwal vs. Rahul Dutta Gupta.***

2. *Vide* order dated 24.02.2025, the Family Court, with the consent of both the parties, granted the visitation rights to the Appellant in respect to his child. Further, *vide* order dated 19.07.2025 the Family Court refused to recall the visitation rights recorded by the Court in its earlier order and keeping in view the peculiar facts of the case, directed that the presence of Counselor be made mandatory when the



father is physically meeting his child.

3. The Family Court *vide* its order dated 26.07.2025, denied the request of the Respondent to postpone the scheduled meeting between the Appellant and his child.

4. Heard learned counsel representing the parties.

5. Learned counsel representing the Appellant submitted that the treatment of the child from a Child Psychologist was necessary before visitation rights could be resumed. It is further submitted that in absence of the Child Psychologist, the child may face difficulties.

6. The Court has considered the submissions.

7. The Family Court has already made efforts to resolve the controversy. A child of the age of 6 years is of very impressionable age and will only respond to whatever is fed into the mind by her parents. Parents have a responsibility to be mindful of what they choose to feed and teach their child. The child should be allowed to grow independently without being influenced by the marital discord between the parents. Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the parents to ensure that their child is nurtured in a way that supports healthy development and growth into a well-rounded individual.

8. With the above observations, the present Appeal, along with pending applications, is disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
AUGUST 27, 2025/sg/sh