



\$~66

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 478/2025 & CRL.M.A. 32589/2025

APARNA MONGA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Nadeem Hussain,
Adv. (through VC)

versus

RAHUL KAPOOR

.....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

06.11.2025

%

1. The present petition is filed against the order dated 31.07.2025 (hereafter '**impugned order**') passed by the learned Family Court, Karkardooma, Shahdara, Delhi in Mt. CASE No./1351/2024, whereby the application filed by the petitioner seeking interim maintenance was dismissed.

2. The learned Family Court, while passing the impugned order, noted that the petitioner, having completed her PhD, is highly qualified and at present is earning a salary of ₹60,000/- month by working as a contractual teacher at DPS Faridabad. It was noted that the bank statement of the petitioner contained certain monthly entries which fell under the head of salary. Consequently, the learned Family Court considering that the petitioner is working and earning an income which is adequate as per her needs, noted that the case of the petitioner is not fit for grant of interim maintenance.

3. The petitioner is essentially not satisfied with the impugned order and submits that she requires more amount for



her maintenance.

4. The petitioner has not disputed the fact that she is presently working as a teacher in DPS, Faridabad and is getting a salary of ₹60,000/- per month. The petitioner has however not pointed out why more amount is required for her maintenance.

5. In such circumstances, this Court finds itself in agreement with the learned Family Court that the petitioner is qualified and at present, is also earning an income which is adequate for her maintenance.

6. Concededly, the impugned order is only an order of interim maintenance and the matter is still pending before the learned Family Court. The learned Family Court would pass a final order in regard to the maintenance after the parties have led their evidence.

7. The petitioner is at liberty to lead evidence before the learned Family Court in support of her contention that more amount is required for her maintenance for which the respondent should be directed to pay her.

8. In view of the above, I find no reason to interfere with the impugned order.

9. The present petition is, therefore, dismissed. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 6, 2025

'KDK'