



\$~49

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 305/2025, CRL.M.A. 19474/2025 & CRL.M.A. 2265/2026**

JASKIRAT SINGH SETHIPetitioner
Through: Mr. Mayank Arora, Mr. Jai Allagh
and Mr. Saksham Tyagi, Advocates
with petitioner in person (*through*
VC).
versus

PEKHNA SETHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Rajiv Bajaj, Mr. Aditya
Kumbhoj, Mr. Nama Arora and Mr.
Vishant Prakash, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA
ORDER
% **01.04.2026**

1. This matter has been taken up out of turn in order to ensure that directions of the Supreme Court are complied with, in letter and spirit. The said directions were issued by the Supreme Court when the petitioner was denied early hearing of this petition on the ground of heavy board. It would be apposite to note that ever since 179 bail applications pending before different benches for past more than an year or two were transferred to this bench, the priority for this bench was to dispose of those applications of persons languishing in jail or apprehending arrest. Besides, there are also a number of writ petitions where prisoners are awaiting release on parole and furlough; those petitions also have to be given priority. It is for this reason that early hearing was denied to the petitioner. Be that as it may, since the



Supreme Court vide order dated 12.03.2026 directed this Court to take up the main matter for hearing or at least to take up the interim application for hearing, I took this matter out of turn. I heard learned counsel for petitioner for about 45 minutes.

2. In the course of arguments, it was pointed out that according to the present petition, earnings of the business entity of the petitioner are Rs. 10,71,654.66 per month. The interim maintenance impugned in this case was Rs. 2,50,000/- per month payable to the present respondent and her two minor children, in addition to which approximately Rs. 1,50,000/- was payable towards school fee of both children. On instructions received from petitioner (*who is stated to be present through videoconferencing*), it is clarified by learned counsel for petitioner that the figure of Rs. 10,71,654.66 mentioned above is the annual earning and not monthly earning.

3. Learned counsel for petitioner contended that the total arrears of maintenance as on date are approximately Rs. 18,00,000/-. On the other hand, learned counsel for respondent claimed that the total arrears are Rs. 1,03,12,007/- (*approximately*). On this aspect, both sides need to make clarifications by way of specific affidavits.

4. Further, it is contended by respondent that apparently, the Supreme Court was not apprised of the fact that similar issue is already pending between the same parties in CONT. CAS. (C) 1419/2024, in which the present petitioner has been directed to appear personally and the submissions made in this case as well as orders, if any passed would have bearing on the said case as well.

5. Most importantly, the petitioner has not filed copies of his income-tax returns to show his actual earnings. Learned counsel for petitioner on



specific instructions of father of his client present in Court submits that the petitioner does file income-tax returns and shall place on record copies of income-tax returns of past 10 years. Besides, the petitioner shall also place on record the income-tax returns of the business entity being run by him. Those returns would be necessary to examine if subject to any modification, operation of the impugned order needs to be stayed.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that he shall file those returns as well as the affidavit mentioned above within one week.

7. At this stage, after dictation of the above order, learned counsel for petitioner submits that petitioner is not agreeable to file the above documents and his application for interim relief may be disposed of today itself. Learned counsel for petitioner again clarifies that it is not that petitioner is not agreeable to file the above mentioned documents and that it is just that he wants disposal of his interim application, today itself. On this, my considered view is that without complete material, even the interim application should not be decided.

8. Relist on 17.04.2026 in Advance List.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

APRIL 1, 2026

'rs'