



\$~3

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 397/2025, CM APPL. 70365/2025 (stay), CM APPL. 70366/2025 (Ex. from filing certified copies of Annexures-B & C) & CM APPL. 70367/2025 (60 days delay in filing appeal)

PRAMODAppellant

Through: Mr. Advocate (Appearance not given).

versus

KARISHMARespondent

Through: Mr. Manish Gupta, Mr. Manoj Kumar, Mr. Mohan Sharma and Mr. Amit Thakur, Advocates.

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

ORDER
20.11.2025

%

1. The present Appeal, under Section 19 of the Family Court Act, 1984, assails the **Order dated 31.07.2025¹** passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi, in an application filed under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, in case bearing HMA No.319/2024, titled as “*Pramod v. Karishma*”.

2. *Vide* the Impugned Order, the learned Family Court, after considering that the Appellant-husband has a credit of Rs.28 Lakhs in his bank account in Punjab National Bank, proceeded to award *ad interim* maintenance @ Rs.10,000/- per month to Respondent-wife.

¹ Impugned Order



3. Learned counsel for the Appellant submits that the Appellant–husband is not working anywhere and is merely assisting his father, who is a priest at the Hanuman Mandir in Inder Puri.
4. This Court is of the considered opinion that Appellant is an able-bodied person, and he is required to maintain his wife.
5. The amount awarded by the learned Family Court is not excessive. Hence, we find no ground to interfere with the Impugned Order.
6. Accordingly, the present Appeal, along with pending applications, if any, stands dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
NOVEMBER 20, 2025/rk/kr/her