



\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

MAT.APP.(F.C.) 432/2025, CM APPL. 80614/2025 (Stay) &
CM APPL. 80615/2025 (Ex.)

ARADHANA TRIPATHI,

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Sudeep Dey, Adv.

versus

ANURAG KAKKAR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Aditya Arora & Mr.
Anirudh Sharma, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN

SHANKAR

ORDER

19.12.2025

%

1. The present appeal has been filed on behalf of the Appellant under Section 19 of the Family Court Act, 1984, assailing the Order dated 11.12.2025 [**“Impugned Order”**] passed by the learned Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, South West, Dwarka, New Delhi in MT. Case No. 30/19 titled “*Anurag Kakkar vs. Aradhana Tripathi.*”

2. By way of the Impugned Order, the learned Family Court, while declining the application filed by the Respondent for interim custody of the minor child during winter vacations, has granted visitation rights to him during the said period, i.e., from 25.12.2025 till 01.01.2025, from 11:00 am to 3:00 pm in Children room, Family Court, Kolhapur, Maharashtra.



3. The minor child, namely, Aadyaansh Raj Kakkar, aged about 12 years, is in the care and custody of the Appellant. The Respondent is the biological father of the minor child.
4. Learned counsel for the Appellant contends that the Respondent has been given visitation rights for the entire winter vacation, which spoils the Christmas and New Year celebration of the minor child. It is submitted that visitation rights for a period of 2-3 days would be sufficient. It is further submitted that during summer vacations, the Respondent was given 2 days of visitation to which the Appellant never objected.
5. Learned counsel appearing for the Appellant further contends that for the present issues between the parties, territorial jurisdiction does not lie in Delhi.
6. As already noticed, the Respondent has been given permission to meet the minor child for a period of 04 hours out of 24 hours. For the remaining period of time, the minor child shall remain in the care and custody of the Appellant.
7. Moreover, such visitation rights have been given only for a period of 07 days, i.e., during winter vacations.
8. The place of visitation has been fixed at Kolhapur, Maharashtra, where the minor child resides.
9. The Respondent, being the biological father, is also well entitled to interact with the minor child in order to develop a bond with him. Moreover, the minor child is an adolescent and would require the company of his father.
10. Hence, this Court finds no ground to interfere with the Order impugned herein.
11. Accordingly, the present Appeal, along with all pending



application(s), if any, stands dismissed.

12. Learned counsel appearing for the Respondent has also filed an appeal against the Impugned Order passed by the learned Family Court, which is yet to be decided. Needless to say, the rights and contentions in the said Appeal are to be decided uninfluenced by the order passed today.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
DECEMBER 19, 2025/v/her