



\$~22

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

+ **MAT.APP.(F.C.) 323/2025 & CM APPL. 55969/2025 (Stay)**

AYUSH AGARWALAppellant

Through: Mr. Prateek Goswami, Mr.
Shashank Goswami and Ms.
Sahil Giri, Advocates.

versus

MEETA AGARWALRespondent

Through: Mr. Himanshu Saxena, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR**

ORDER

08.12.2025

%

1. The present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant - Husband under Section 19 of the Family Court Act, 1984, assailing the Order dated 16.07.2025 [**"Impugned Order"**], passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi, in case being HMA 2168/2023, titled as "*Ayush Agarwal v. Meeta Agarwal*". By way of the Impugned Order, the learned Family Court has allowed the application of the Respondent - Wife under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955.

2. Upon taking note of the fact that the Appellant's monthly income in January, 2024 was Rs. 3,53,929/-, the learned Family Court directed him to pay an amount of Rs. 60,000/- per month to the Respondent, which includes maintenance towards the minor child, who is studying in Modern School, Barakhamba Road, Delhi.

3. Learned counsel for the Appellant submits that the Respondent is living on the fourth floor of the matrimonial home and is earning



Rs. 50,000/- per month, and she is also required to contribute towards the education of the child. Whereas it is submitted by the learned counsel for the Respondent that her income is Rs. 40,000/- and not Rs. 50,000/.

4. This Court has considered the submissions advanced by both the parties.

5. The Appellant is earning more than Rs. 3,50,000/- per month, whereas the Respondent is earning Rs. 40,000/- as stated by the Respondent's counsel. Moreover, it is further admitted by learned counsel for the Appellant that the Appellant was contributing at the rate Rs. 45,000/- per month towards the education of the child.

6. Having considered all relevant aspects of the matter, this Court notes that even after paying Rs. 60,000/- per month, the Appellant will be left with nearly Rs. 3,00,000/- per month in his hands.

7. In view of the aforesaid position, there is no ground to interfere with the impugned Order.

8. Accordingly, the present Appeal, along with pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
DECEMBER 08, 2025/tk/her