



\$~25

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

+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 305/2025**

JASKIRAT SINGH SETHI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Mayank Arora, Mr. Jai Allagh,  
Mr. Amit Lakhani, Mr. Saksham  
Tyagi and Mr. Ekam Batth,  
Advocates

versus

PEKHNA SETHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Udit Mehra, Mr. Aditya Kumbhaj  
and Mr. Naman Arora, Advocates

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

**ORDER**

% **16.05.2026**

**CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 305/2025 & CRL.M.A. 19474/2025 (Stay)**

1. Today, I have heard learned counsel for petitioner for about 45 minutes with certain interjections from the other side.
2. Broadly speaking, one of the aspects addressed today is as follows.
3. The present respondent categorically stated in her income affidavit (*pdf 78*) that she had zero income, but in her income tax returns of 2022-23 (*pdf 1055 LCR*), she disclosed income of more than Rs. 19,00,000/-. This, according to the petitioner would disentitle her any maintenance and invite perjury action. This aspect is explained by learned counsel for respondent, taking me through her bank account statements (*pdf 595 onwards*) and it is explained by him that there are credit entries of heavy amount as cash deposit with immediate withdrawal of the said cash amount in the name of



school of the children of the parties and it is explained by learned counsel for the respondent that the ITR reflects the income on the basis of those credit entries, but she did not have any running income.

4. Another aspect touched today was the alleged role of the petitioner in Sethi Forex. Learned counsel for petitioner submitted that he collected documentary records from Sethi Forex and according to the same, as a matter of coincidence two of its directors are named Jaskirat Singh and Mrs. Gurmeet Kaur, i.e. co-names of the petitioner and his mother. Name of father of the present petitioner is Mr. Jasvinder Singh while name of father of the said director of Sethi Forex is Mr. Kulwant Singh. This also, according to learned counsel for petitioner would be relevant to note that the learned trial court was misled into believing the financial status of the petitioner and consequently would disentitle the respondent of any maintenance.

5. Apart from this, learned counsel for petitioner has also addressed on general propositions of law today.

6. It is 04:45pm and board is yet to be wound up.

7. List for further arguments on 18.05.2026 in Advance List.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA, J**

**MAY 16, 2026**

**'rs'**