



\$~5

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

+ **MAT.APP.(F.C.) 208/2026**

VIVEK MALHOTRA

.....Appellant

Through: Appellant in person.

versus

SHILPA SOOD

.....Respondent

Through: *Nemo.*

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TEJAS KARIA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MADHU JAIN

ORDER

% **15.06.2026**

CM APPL. 38807/2026(Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The Application stands disposed of.

MAT.APP.(F.C.) 208/2026

3. The present Appeal has been preferred under Section 19 of the Family Courts Act, 1984, assailing the order dated 03.06.2026 (“**Impugned Order**”) passed by the learned Family Court, North-West District, Rohini Courts, Delhi, in G.P. No. 64/2021, whereby the Appellant’s application seeking parenting time with his minor son, aged approximately 6 years and 9 months, during the summer vacation period was disposed of by granting only three additional sessions of three hours each at a shopping mall, i.e., an aggregate of approximately 9 hours during a summer vacation spanning about 51 days.
4. The Appellant, appearing in person, submitted that the learned Family Court expressly recognised the father’s entitlement to spend time with the child during the summer vacation and observed that such interaction would assist in developing and maintaining a healthy parent-child bond. It was,



however, contended that, despite such recognition, the Impugned Order declined to grant the substantive relief sought by the Appellant without recording reasons and without indicating any reasonable arrangement for facilitating meaningful parental bonding, notwithstanding the protracted period of litigation during which the child has grown from an infant of 15 months to nearly 7 years of age.

5. It was further submitted by the Appellant that the grant of merely three sessions of three hours each, aggregating to 9 hours, could not reasonably serve the purpose of granting visitation. It was also submitted that the summer vacation period affords an appropriate opportunity for extended parenting time without disruption to the child's daily school routine.

6. The Appellant further submitted that the Impugned Order records neither any unfitness nor incapacity on the part of the Appellant as father, nor any risk or detriment to the welfare of the child. It was contended that the welfare of the child necessarily requires substantial and meaningful time with both parents to foster a genuine relationship, and that the grant of only 9 hours during the entirety of the summer vacation is manifestly insufficient for that purpose.

7. It was also submitted that directing the interaction to take place in a crowded Shopping Mall does not afford a meaningful opportunity for the child to interact naturally with the Appellant and members of the paternal family in a home-like environment. It was further submitted that the learned Family Court has, for the last five years, consistently directed interaction with the minor child at the same Shopping Mall, and that the child no longer has any enthusiasm for visiting the said venue in the absence of any new or engaging activity.



8. The Appellant additionally submitted that a duration of three hours is too short to permit any meaningful shared activity, including even watching a film with the child. It was further contended that the child ought to have been permitted to visit other places with the Appellant, such as a temple or a restaurant, rather than the interaction being confined to the Shopping Mall alone.

9. Accordingly, the Appellant prayed that the Impugned Order be set aside and modified to the extent that it restricts the Appellant's interaction with the minor child to three hours at Pacific Mall, Delhi, and that the Appellant be granted substantial parenting time with the minor child during the remainder of the summer vacation period, or, at the very least, be permitted interaction outside the confines of Pacific Mall, Delhi, at age-appropriate educational, recreational, cultural, religious, and sporting venues, including parks, zoos, museums, historical monuments, places of worship, and children's films.

10. We have heard the Appellant, who appeared in person, and have perused the Impugned Order.

11. The Impugned Order records that the Court, acting as guardian of the minor, remained mindful of the paramount importance of the child's wellbeing and welfare, and that the sole and paramount consideration is the interest and welfare of the minor child.

12. The Impugned Order further records that the minor child is approximately 6½ years of age and has been in the care and custody of his mother. It further notes that the Appellant had been granted unsupervised visitation rights on the 1st and 4th Saturdays of every month from 2:00 PM to 5:00 PM at Pacific Mall, Delhi. Accordingly, while the learned Family Court was not inclined to grant interim custody of the minor child to the Appellant



during the summer vacation, the Appellant was granted unsupervised visitation with the minor child on 09.06.2026, 16.06.2026, and 23.06.2026 from 3:00 PM to 6:00 PM at Pacific Mall, Delhi, so as to enable the Appellant to spend additional time with the child during the vacation and thereby foster a healthy bond.

13. The Appellant's submission that the time granted for interaction with the minor child was insufficient cannot be accepted, inasmuch as the learned Family Court issued the directions while keeping the welfare and wellbeing of the minor child in due consideration. The learned Family Court also took into consideration the previous orders concerning the Appellant's visitation rights and, on account of the summer vacation, increased the duration of visitation.

14. As regards the venue of interaction being a Shopping Mall, we do not find it appropriate to modify the Impugned Order, particularly as the Appellant had previously been granted visitation at the same place and had not raised any objection thereto on earlier occasions.

15. Accordingly, we find no infirmity in the Impugned Order, which grants relief to the Appellant by permitting unsupervised visitation with the minor child on the dates specified therein. Consequently, we no sufficient ground is made out by the Appellant to set aside or modify the Impugned Order.

16. In view of the same, the present Appeal stands dismissed.

TEJAS KARIA, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

MADHU JAIN, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 15, 2026/sms

MAT.APP.(F.C.) 208/2026

Page 4 of 4