



\$~29

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

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 422/2024 and CM APPL. 73239/2024
ANURAG NAGAppellant

Through: Mr. Brijesh Kumar Sharma,
Adv.

versus

SUPARNA GHOSHRespondent

Through: Mr. Alok vajpayee, Mr. Puneet
Sharma and Ms. Deepti
Sharma.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

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

ORDER

%

05.08.2025

1. The present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant (Respondent's Husband) under Section 19 of Family Court Act, 1984 assailing the correctness of the order dated 14.11.2024 passed by Ld. Judge Family Court, (NE) Karkardooma Court, New Delhi in HMA No. 851/2021 captioned "**Anurag Nag vs. Superna Ghosh**", whereby the Family Court awarded interim maintenance of Rs.20,000/- per month to the Respondent.

2. Admittedly, the Appellant was drawing monthly salary of Rs.1.17 Lakhs, whereas the Respondent is working as a Teacher in a private school drawing a salary of Rs.16,000/- per month.

3. Learned counsel representing the Appellant submits that out of Rs. 1.17 Lakhs, the Appellant pays Rs.40,000/- towards repayment of loan as also rent of Rs.16,000/-, besides maintaining his aged parents.

4. It is further submitted that the Respondent is in possession of a complete floor, which belongs to Appellants' mother. Additionally, it



is contended that she has invested huge amounts in mutual funds.

5. *Per contra*, learned counsel representing the Respondent submits that the Appellant was owner of the flat, which was transferred by him in favour of his mother just before the application under Section 24 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 was filed.

6. Learned Counsel representing the Respondent further contends that the Family Court has found that the investment in mutual funds were carried by the Appellant by using the bank account of his wife.

7. The Court has considered the submissions that the Family Court has awarded only Rs.20,000/- per month, while the monthly income of the Appellant is almost Rs.1.20 lakhs.

8. The Appellant is stated to have borrowed loan to purchase immovable property. This amount cannot be deducted from the income of the Appellant.

9. The Respondent is getting a very meager salary, therefore, she is required to be provided with support.

10. We find no ground to interfere with the Family Court's order. The present Appeal is dismissed.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
AUGUST 05, 2025/sg/sh