



2025:DHC:2118-DB



\$~6

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI*****Date of decision: 28.03.2025***

+ CONT.CAS(C) 1741/2023



.....Petitioner


Through: Ms. Shambhavi, Adv. along with  
petitioner in person.

versus



.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Shreya Singhal, Ms. M. Keditsu,  
and Ms. Kushagra Singla, Advs.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR****NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)**

1. This petition has been filed by the petitioner complaining of violation of the terms and conditions for physical visitation as stipulated in the Order dated 07.10.2023 passed by the learned Family Court-02, South-East, Saket, in , wherein it was specifically directed that the respondent herein, who is petitioner in the said proceedings, shall not be accompanied by his parents or his other family members or any other persons or take photographs or make videography of his meeting with the children. It is the case of petitioner that there was a breach of these conditions of visitation in the visitation ordered by this Court *vide* its Order dated 09.11.2023.

2. This Court, *vide* its aforesaid Order, had directed that the respondent shall be entitled to a visitation, along with his parents, with the children at the office of the petitioner on the occasion of *Diwali* on 12.11.2023.

Signature Not Verified

Signed By: VIJAYA  
LAKSHMI DOBHAL  
Signing Date: 02.04.2025  
16:20:58**CONT.CAS(C) 1741/2023****Page 1 of 3**



2025:DHC:2118-DB



3. It is the case of the petitioner herein that as the said office space was not available due to the employer having *Pooja* in the office, the petitioner arranged for a private conference room '*in her other office*' which was located in the same area and was a co-working space. Accordingly, she sent an e-mail dated 10.11.2023 to the respondent no. 1 informing him about the booking of the venue for the visitation and asked him to bear the cost for the same.

4. At the outset, we note that there was no direction for the respondent no. 1 to bear the cost of the venue. In fact, this Court, in its Order dated 09.11.2023, allowed the visitation of the children with the respondent no.1 along with his parents at the office of the petitioner, without stipulating any cost to be borne by the respondent no. 1.

5. Be that as it may, the petitioner raises further grievance that '*when the respondent reached the venue of visitation, he intentionally disturbed the petitioner, her family members, her employers with the sole aim of shattering her confidence, curb her source of living by trying to get her fired from work and reduce her existence to mere groveling*'. The petitioner further claims that the respondent also started making videos and clicking pictures without permission. It is with these allegations that the petitioner has filed the present petition.

6. During the course of submissions, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner had also made videography of the respondent no. 1, who was making the videography first of the visitation and creating a ruckus.

7. As the video clips recorded at the behest of the petitioner have not been filed along with the petition, we called upon her to show the video to



2025:DHC:2118-DB



us.

8. She has shown the video to us on her laptop.

9. On watching the video, it is our considered opinion that in fact, it was the petitioner and persons along with her who were instigating the respondent no. 1 into reacting in the way he did. We further find that the respondent no. 1 was accompanied by his parents, that is, the respondent no. 2 and 3, of which, we have been informed that the respondent no. 3 has unfortunately passed away on 12.02.2025. We further notice that in the video, the respondent no. 2 even tried to request the persons accompanying the petitioner not to mock the respondent no. 1 and to allow the visitation to take place peacefully. However, this request, as is apparent from the video, was again mocked at.

10. We, therefore, find no merit in the present contempt petition. The same is, accordingly, dismissed.

11. We further direct the petitioner to pay a cost of Rs. 50,000/-, out of which Rs. 25,000/- shall be paid to the respondent no. 1 while the remaining Rs. 25,000/- shall be deposited with the Delhi High Court Advocates Welfare Fund, within a period of four weeks from today.

**NAVIN CHAWLA, J**

**RENU BHATNAGAR, J**

**MARCH 28, 2025**

*p/IK*

*Click here to check corrigendum, if any*