



\$~87

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

+ **CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 16/2026**

SHARMIL MANIHAR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Amit Tanwar, Adv. (through
VC)

versus

MUKESH KUMAR MANIHAR

.....Respondent

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SAURABH BANERJEE

ORDER

%

14.01.2026

CRL.M.A. 1090/2026 (*for exemption*)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

CRL.REV.P.(MAT.) 16/2026

3. By virtue of the of the present petition under *Section 422* of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (**BNSS**) read with *Section 19(4)* of the Family Courts Act, 1984, the petitioners seek setting aside of the impugned order dated 26.11.2025, passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Karkardooma Court, Delhi in MT No. 68/2024 as also seek enhancement of the interim maintenance of the revisionist as per the living standard of the respondent.
4. Upon the petitioners taking requisite steps within a period of *one week*, issue notice to the respondent by all permissible modes, returnable on 29.04.2026.



5. Keeping in view the nature of the facts and disputes involved, the parties are hereby called upon to file their respective written synopsis instead of reply/ rejoinder not exceeding *five pages*, giving a chronological list of dates and events and relevant documents, if any, alongwith duly highlighted judgments setting out the propositions of law therein, they wish to rely upon within a period of *four weeks*.

6. Renotify on 29.04.2026.

SAURABH BANERJEE, J

JANUARY 14, 2026/bh