



\$~7

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 823/2024 CM APPL. 9182/2025 CM APPL.**
9183/2025

ROHIT LAKHANEPetitioner

Through: Ms. Simran Bhatti, Adv.

versus

CHARUPRIYA SHARMARespondent

Through: Ms. Heena Dawar, Adv. &
Respondent (through VC).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER

% **16.05.2025**

1. Pursuant to previous order dated 14th February 2025, *Ms. Heena Dawar*, Advocate is present in Court on behalf of respondent. Respondent appears *through VC* from Mathura.
2. It is stated that the order dated 4th September 2023, of which compliance is sought, was not in the knowledge of the respondent.
3. To this, counsel for petitioner points out that *Shri Ashok Kumar Sharma*, counsel for respondent had appeared on 4th September 2023 and his appearance is recorded.
4. Notwithstanding the same, the essential point taken by the respondent is that she has been residing in *Govardhan, Mathura* along with the child, since May 2022 and the child has been studying there as well.
5. A certificate from *Sri Sri Radhakant Temple Govardhan* is also being



handed up for perusal, along with the reply, which is still lying under objections.

6. There are other documents which have been filed along with the said reply, to advert to the fact that the child along with the mother was already there in Mathura since 2022 and this was in the knowledge of the petitioner as well; though this is refuted by counsel for petitioner.

7. In addition, counsel for respondent states that they have filed an application for setting aside the order dated 4th September 2023, which is still pending.

8. Accordingly, respondent will file the records of the said application which has been filed for setting aside the order dated 4th September 2023, along with the order sheets after the filing, till date, as part of the additional affidavit.

9. Copy of the same, along with the existing reply and additional affidavit will be served to counsel for petitioner, within the next three weeks.

10. As regards the plea of petitioner that, on this account they have not been able to meet the child, the petitioner is at liberty to seek the requisite relief from the Family Court.

11. It is noted with dismay that despite specific orders of this Court on 14th February 2025 that counsel for respondent should remove the objections in the reply that had been filed and that the same be placed on record within two weeks from that date, even after three months, neither the said objections were removed nor was the reply placed on record.

12. This position cannot be maintained. The respondent must come fair and clean to the Court.



13. Though counsel for respondent gives her apology, directions passed today will be duly complied with in its right earnest with complete communication to counsel for petitioner, in order that they are in a position to seek appropriate remedies.
14. List on 31st July 2025.
15. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

MAY 16, 2025/ak/na