



\$~5

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

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 438/2025, CM APPL. 81578/2025, CM APPL. 81579/2025 and CM APPL. 81580/2025

SHAKTI SINGH .....Appellant

Through: Mr. Paramjeet Singh, Adv.

versus

RITU SINGH .....Respondent

Through: Mr. S. K. Dayal, Adv.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL**

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

**ORDER**

**23.12.2025**

%

1. The present Appeal has been filed by the Appellant assailing the correctness of the order dated 04.10.2025 [hereinafter referred to as 'Impugned Order'] passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Shahdara, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi in MT Cases No. 663/2022 captioned *Ritu Singh vs. Shakti Singh*.

2. By way of the Impugned Order, the Appellant has been directed to pay interim maintenance @ ₹20,000/- per month to the Respondent-Wife.

3. The Court has come to the conclusion that the Appellant, besides being an Advocate, is also running a placement agency, while earning approximately ₹70,000/- to ₹80,000/- per month.

4. The couple has no child and the Court has only directed the Appellant to part with 1/4<sup>th</sup> of his monthly income.

5. Learned counsel representing the Appellant submits that the placement agency is being run by the father of the Appellant and he



has no role to play in the day-to-day operation of the same.

6. This Court has considered the submissions and observes that the placement agency is registered in the name of the Appellant, who is the only child of his parents. Moreover, only interim maintenance has been assessed on the basis of the material placed before the Family Court.

7. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this Court finds no ground to interfere.

8. Hence, the present Appeal, along with pending applications, is dismissed.

**ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.**

**HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.**

**DECEMBER 23, 2025**

*s.godara/kb*