



\$~17

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 395/2025, CM APPL. 69330/2025 (Exp.),
CM APPL. 69331/2025 (delay of 24 days in filing appeal), CM
APPL. 69332/2025 (stay) & CM APPL. 69333/2025 (Addl.
documents)

GAUTAM BAHRIAppellant

Through: Mr. P.S. Bindra, Senior
Advocate with Mr. Kartik
Khanna, Advocate.

versus

POOJA BAHRIRespondent

Through: None.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR

% **ORDER**
07.11.2025

1. The present Appeal has been filed under Section 19 of the Family Courts Act, 1984, assailing the Judgment and Order dated 21.07.2025 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, South-East District, Saket Courts, New Delhi, in HMA No. 3491/2023, titled **“Pooja Bahri versus Gautam Bahri”**, whereby the learned Family Court allowed the Respondent’s application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 [**“the Act”**], seeking *pendente lite* maintenance from the Appellant.

2. Learned Family Court, after finding that the Appellant/



husband's Income Tax Return [“**ITR**”] reflected his monthly expenses amounting to Rs. 10 Lakhs, proceeded to grant maintenance under Section 24 of the Act to the Respondent/wife at the rate of Rs. 2.5 Lakhs per month.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the Appellant submits that a property situated at Greater Kailash-II, New Delhi - 110048, was purchased by the Appellant in the joint names of the Appellant and Respondent, which is now exclusively owned by the Respondent/wife, as the Appellant transferred his share therein. He further submits that, as per his ITR, his monthly income is Rs. 3.25 Lakhs and not Rs. 10 Lakhs.

4. Learned Family Court has duly considered these submissions and found that *prima facie* the Appellant had understated his income in his ITRs.

5. The Appellant is a Director in a Jaipur Golden Transport Company Pvt. Ltd. as well as Bahri Properties Pvt. Ltd. If his monthly expenses are Rs. 10 Lakhs per month, it is difficult to accept that his monthly income is only Rs. 3.25 Lakhs. Moreover, there are credit entries in his account for the month ending on 31.03.2024 to the tune of Rs. 12,91,91,481/-.

6. Keeping in view of the aforesaid position, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the Impugned Order passed by the learned Family Court.

7. However, it is observed that if there is any subsequent change in circumstances affecting the quantum of maintenance, it may be open to the Appellant to file an appropriate application before the learned Family Court seeking modification of the said order in accordance with law.



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

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
NOVEMBER 7, 2025/nd/va/rgk