



\$~37

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

+ **CM(M) 205/2025**

TANUJ DHAWAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

SONICA SINGHI

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **03.02.2025**

CM APPL. 6299/2025 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

CM(M) 205/2025 & CM APPL. 6300/2025 (Stay)

1. This is a petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India seeking to set aside the order dated 21.10.2024 passed by the learned Principal Judge, Family Court, North-West District Rohini, Delhi in HMA No. 2355/2021 tilted as '*Sonica Singhi vs Tanuj Dhawan*'.
2. The Petitioner submits that he could not file the written statement within the stipulated period due to serious defects in the petition and also because the parties were referred for counselling.
3. It is further submitted that the rejoinder has not been filed by the respondent as per the e-filing rules in as much as the copy of the rejoinder



supplied to the petitioner does not bear the complete pagination and signatures of the respondent.

4. Perusal of the order dated 21.10.2024 reveals that the petitioner appeared for the first time in Court on 16.11.2022. He was directed by the Court to file the written statement. The matter was simultaneously referred to the Counsellor for exploring the possibility of settlement. On the next hearing i.e. 18.03.2023, it was reported by the parties that conciliation proceedings were still going on, whereupon the matter was adjourned to 14.07.2023 with directions to the respondent to file the written statement, if settlement fails.

5. On 14.07.2023, the parties reported to the Court that the matter could not be settled and the Court adjourned the matter to 01.12.2023 with direction to the petitioner to file the written statement. Written Statement was not filed even on 01.12.2023.

6. It is evident that even though the matter was sent for counselling the Court had repeatedly directed the respondent to file the written statement, in case the conciliation fails. It was incumbent upon the petitioner to file the written statement within the stipulated period of 90 days at least from the date when the conciliation proceedings were over. The averment of the serious defect in the petition is vague, more so, no such defect was pointed out before the trial court.

7. Admittedly, the written statement was not filed within the stipulated period of 90 days and therefore, the Family Court was constrained to impose of cost of Rs 10,000/- vide order dated 01.12.2023. Application of petitioner for waiver of cost was dismissed on 21.10.2024.



8. The Court finds no illegality or perversity in the impugned order passed by the learned Family Court. There is no merit in the petition. The petition is dismissed.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

FEBRUARY 3, 2025

Sk/nc