



\$~72 & 73

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

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 378/2025, CM APPL. 66919/2025 (for interim visitation), CM APPL. 66920/2025 (delay of 21 days in filing appeal), CM APPL. 66921/2025 (permission to file lengthy synopsis) & CM APPL. 66922/2025 (Ex.)

VIJYANT SABHARWALAppellant

Through: Mr. Shadan Farasat, Senior Advocate with Mr. Bharat Gupta, Ms. Swapnil Shukla, Mr. Harshit Anand and Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocates.

versus

CHARANJEET KAURRespondent

Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari, Mr. Rahul Kumar, Ms. Payal Dhupar and Ms. Indira Murthy, Advocates.

73

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 379/2025, CM APPL. 66964/2025 (stay), CM APPL. 66965/2025 (Ex.), CM APPL. 66966/2025 (delay of 10 days in re-filing the Appeal)

CHARANJEET KAURAppellant

Through: Mr. Murari Tiwari, Mr. Rahul Kumar, Ms. Payal Dhupar and Ms. Indira Murthy, Advocates.

versus

VIJYANT SABHARWALRespondent

Through: Mr. Shadan Farasat, Senior Advocate with Mr. Bharat Gupta, Ms. Swapnil Shukla, Mr. Harshit Anand and Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

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



ORDER

30.10.2025

%

1. The present Cross-Appeals, under Section 19(1) of the Family Courts Act, 1984, have been preferred by the parties impugning the Order dated 23.08.2025 passed by the learned Family Court, North District Court, Rohini, Delhi, in GP No. 22/2023.

2. These Cross-Appeals are filed against a common order passed by the learned Family Court while disposing of an application filed by Mr. Vijyant Sabharwal (the father of the children) seeking enhancement of his visitation schedule with the children. The father is residing in Germany and visits India once in every three months. The learned Family Court has passed the following effective Order:-

“ I have interacted with the children in my chamber and a separate memorandum of interaction has been prepared.

Petitioner has filed an application for enhancement in the visitation scheduled with the children. Presently, the petitioner who is a resident of Germany has been permitted visitation with the children whenever he comes to India during 03:30 PM to 6 PM and he has also been permitted to take the children out. During the interaction with children, they did not show any interest in enhanced visitation primarily stating that they get bored with the petitioner. The petitioner states that because of the limited time, he cannot spend a good quality time with them. In future, he will make the meetings more to the interest of the children if he is granted some enhanced time. The respondent states that she has never insisted on the upper time schedule and has never called the petitioner to send the children back and she is agreeable to the enhanced timings stating that the timings should not clash with the classes of the children including the sports schedule and other co-curricular activities. She states that the petitioner may accompany the kids to their classes. She states that most of the classes are at home only and the petitioner may come to the home.

Since the respondent is not inflexible for the timings and it will be in the interest of the children to spend more quality time with the father, the petitioner, during his visits to India, is allowed to meet the children, and take them out every day without any time restriction. The meetings should not clash with the school timings. The petitioner can also meet the children at the residence of the respondent if the children have to attend some class at the home. If the children are comfortable, they can also have overnight stay



with the petitioner but the children be not forced in any manner. It should be ensured that the timings should not get reduced from the existing arrangement. The petitioner shall beforehand communicate to the respondent about his schedule of visit and the respondent will make necessary arrangements to ensure that there is minimum clash with the meeting. She should make an endeavor to reschedule the classes during those dates. It is reiterated that timings of the meetings should not get reduced in any manner from the existing arrangement. The application stands disposed off.

Put up for further proceedings on 15.11.2025.

Copy of this order be given dasti.”

3. The father contends that, in the absence of a definite time and period, there is no effective visitation because whenever he requests the Respondent, there is some issue or the other raised by the Respondent wife.
4. *Per Contra*, learned counsel for the Respondent, who has also filed an Appeal, submits that they are open to visitation subject to availability of time.
5. While deciding such applications, the Court is expected to pass a categorical specific order depicting the time and place of visitation, particularly when the parties are contesting the litigation.
6. In view of the above, the impugned order is set aside, with a direction to the learned Family Court to pass a fresh, detailed order specifying the period, dates, and place for the father's visitation rights.
7. With these observations, both these Appeals along with pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.
8. A photocopy of the order passed today be kept in the connected matters.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
OCTOBER 30, 2025/nd/rou