



\$~54 & 55

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

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 331/2024

MANJU ARORA

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Prabhjit Jauhar, Ms. Shreya Narayan, Mr. Sehaj Kataria, Ms. Chahat Raghav and Mr. Tanay Kalia, Advocates.

versus

SACHIN ARORA

.....Respondent

Through: Ms. Preeti Singh, Mr. Sunklan Porwal, Ms. Anuradha Anand, Ms. Sakshi Trivedi, Ms. Kriti Dahiya and Mr. Akshay Chabra, Advocates.

55

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 21/2025, CM APPL. 2887/2025 (Stay) & CM APPL. 2888/2025 (Delay of 62 days in filing the appeal)

SACHIN ARORA

.....Appellant

Through: Ms. Preeti Singh, Mr. Sunklan Porwal, Ms. Anuradha Anand, Ms. Sakshi Trivedi, Ms. Kriti Dahiya and Mr. Akshay Chabra, Advocates.

versus

MANJU ARORA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Prabhjit Jauhar, Ms. Shreya Narayan, Mr. Sehaj Kataria, Ms. Chahat Raghav and Mr. Tanay Kalia, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

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

ORDER
19.11.2025

%

1. This Order shall dispose of two connected Appeals i.e.



MAT.APP.(F.C.) 331/2024 filed by the wife i.e. Manju Arora herein and MAT.APP.(F.C.) 21/2025 filed by the husband i.e. Sachin Arora herein, under Section 19 of the Family Courts Act, 1984, challenging the Order dated 31.07.2024 passed by the **learned Judge, Family Court-01, West District, Tis Hazari Courts, New Delhi**¹, in an application filed under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 in case being HMA 1724/2022, titled “*Manju Arora v. Sachin Arora*”.

2. In the present case, the dispute is with regard to assessment of maintenance *pendente lite* during the pendency of the divorce proceedings.

3. The learned Family Court, after proceeding to assess the income of the husband @ Rs. 5-6 lakhs per month, awarded an amount of Rs.40,000/- per month as *pendente lite* maintenance to the wife who was residing in the same house. Now, she has been directed to move out in view of Judgment dated 30.10.2025 passed by this Court in case being **RFA(OS) 64/2025 titled “Manju Arora v. Neelam Arora & Anr.”**.

4. The parents of the husband (in-laws of the wife) have agreed to pay Rs.85,000/- per month to the wife towards rent, electricity and water charges. The daughter of the parties who was previously studying in London has now returned to Delhi. The learned Trial Court has noticed that the husband owns as many as seven properties in Delhi. He is also utilizing five shops and a godown for his automobile spare parts business. It has also come on record that the family maintains three cars including a Mercedes C-Class.

5. Learned counsel for the husband submits that the said car is a 2002 model which is now a scrap. She further submits that the

¹ Family Court



husband is still borrowing amounts from his parents and that is how he has sustained the payments till now.

6. Learned counsel for the wife has drawn the attention of the Court to a photograph where the husband is sporting a Breguet watch worth Rs. 26 lakhs.

7. As already stated, the Appellant has to fend for herself as a result of the Judgment dated 30.10.2025. The husband and his family are residing in an upmarket place, i.e., Shivaji Enclave, New Delhi in a house measuring 309 square yards.

8. Keeping in view all these facts, this Court is of the considered opinion that now the husband is not required to transmit huge amounts to his daughter for her studies who was previously in London.

9. The wife is also entitled to maintain herself in the same manner as she used to reside in the family of her husband.

10. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the present case, the husband is directed to pay maintenance @ Rs. 1,00,000/-, per month from the date of the application preferred before the Trial Court.

11. With these observations, the present connected Appeals along with the pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

12. A photocopy of this Order be kept in connected matter.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
NOVEMBER 19, 2025/tk/kr