



\$~10 to 12 & 18

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
CM(M) 2800/2024 & CM APPL. 35360/2024-Interim relief, CM
APPL. 50633/2024-Dir. by pet.
VIMLENDU KUMAR JHAPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person
versus

MINAL BHATNAGARRespondent
Through: Malavika Rajkotia and Ms. Trisha
Gupta, Advocates alongwith
respondent in person.

11

CONT.CAS(C) 1736/2024 & CM APPL. 64776/2024-Exp
VIMLENDU KUMAR JHAPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person
versus

MINAL BHATNAGARRespondent
Through: Malavika Rajkotia and Ms. Trisha
Gupta, Advocates alongwith
respondent in person.

12

CONT.CAS(C) 666/2025 & CM APPL. 25337/2025-Exp
VIMLENDU KUMAR JHAPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person
versus

MINAL BHATNAGARRespondent
Through: Malavika Rajkotia and Ms. Trisha
Gupta, Advocates alongwith
respondent in person.

18

+ CONT.CAS(C) 935/2025 & CM APPL. 37807/2025-Exp
VIMLENDU KUMAR JHAPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person
versus

MINAL BHATNAGARRespondent
Through: Malavika Rajkotia and Ms. Trisha
Gupta, Advocates alongwith
respondent in person.



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

% **11.09.2025**

1. At the outset, relying upon the judgment dated 16.10.2024 titled “***Dr Geetanjali Aggarwal vs Dr Manoj Aggarwal***” passed by the Full Bench of this Court, learned counsel for the respondent submits that the present petition being CM(M) 2800/2024 filed under *Article 227* of the Constitution of India is *per se* not maintainable. She further submits that since the issue *qua* the maintainability of an appeal under *Section 19* of the Family Courts Act, 1984 has been settled and put to rest by virtue of the pronouncement of the Full Bench of this Court in ***Dr. Geetanjali (supra)***, the present petition being CM(M) 2800/2024, as also the alleged contempt petitions which are also arising out of the orders passed therein, are all not maintainable.
2. *Qua* the aforesaid, Mr. Vimlendu Kumar Jha, petitioner appearing in person submits that he has serious reservations to the said submission of the learned counsel for the respondent, as also CM(M) 2800/2024 along with the contempt petitions filed from the orders passed therein are very much maintainable. In fact, he submits that this Court was proceeding to hear all the petitions even after the passing of the decision of the Full Bench of this Court in ***Dr. Geetanjali (supra)***.
3. In any event, he seeks and is granted a period of two weeks for going through the same and to address arguments.
4. Accordingly, renotify on 07.11.2025 at 03:00 PM.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2025/So

SAURABH BANERJEE, J.