

ITEM NO.1

COURT NO.6

SECTION II-C

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Criminal Appeal No(s). 205-206/2022

AMAN LOHIA

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

HIGH COURT OF DELHI

Respondent(s)

([FOR DIRECTIONS] )

WITH

SLP(Cr1) No. 1324-1329/2022 (II-C)

SLP(Cr1) No. 11659/2019 (II-C)

SLP(Cr1) No. 1330-1335/2022 (II-C)

SLP(Cr1) No. 410-411/2020 (II-C)

SLP(Cr1) No. 400-402/2020 (II-C)

SLP(Cr1) No. 1336-1344/2022 (II-C)

T.C.(C) No. 26/2021 (XVI-A)

Date : 10-03-2022 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KISHAN KAUL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. SUNDRESH

In It.1 &amp; 1.4

Mr. Mukul Rohatagi, Sr. Adv.  
Ms. Geeta Luthra, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Rajat Bhalla, Adv.  
Ms. Asmita Narula, Adv.  
Ms. Apoorva Maheshwari, Adv.  
Mr.. Amarjeet Singh, AOR

In 1.6

Mr. Viresh B. Saharya, AOR  
Mr. Akshat Agarwal, Adv.

In 1.2,1.3.1.5

Ms. Geeta Luthra, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Rupesh Kumar, AOR  
Mr. Narendera M Sharma, Adv.  
Mr. Siddharth Jain, Adv.  
Ms. Neelam Sharma, Adv.  
Ms. Pankhuri Shrivastava, Adv.

Mr. Mukul Kumar, AOR

For Respondent(s) Mr. Parag P. Tripathi, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Shyam Divan, Sr. Adv.  
Mrs. Malavika Rajkotia, Adv.  
Mrs. Vanshaja Shukla, AOR  
Ms. Akriti Tyagi, Adv.  
Mr. Mayank Grover, Adv.  
Ms. Riya Krishnamurthy, Adv.  
Mr. Sajal Singhai, Adv.  
Mr. Sudipto Sirkar, Adv.  
Mr. Anirudh Dusaj, Adv.

Mr. Chirag M. Shroff, AOR  
Mr. Amandeep Mehta, Adv.

Mr. Ashok Panigrahi, Adv.  
Ms. Shradha Deshmukh, Adv.  
Mr. Sughosh Subramanyam, Adv.  
Ms. Indira Bhakjar, adv.  
Mr. Arvind Kumar Sharma, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

The three learned senior counsels have devoted some time but require some more time to work out a possible settlement. We have put to the learned counsels that they should concentrate on the financial terms for a mutual divorce and bridge the gaps insofar as the custody/visitation rights issues are concerned. If some gaps still remain, they can inform their parties, that the Court will endeavour to work them out for the benefit of the child with the assistance of the counsels and it is open to the parties also to attend the court proceedings.

One request made by learned counsel for the

respondents is that as per the present arrangement, the child goes to the appellant everyday from 5.00 p.m. to 7.00 p.m. It is stated that the school hours of the child are from 8.00 a.m. to 4.15 p.m. and thus it tends to put a strain on the child. Mr. Parag P. Tripathi, learned senior counsel submits that he does not want to restrict the time period with the father but only wants re-arrangement with longer time over the weekend with the father.

We thus for time being modify the arrangement of visiting rights exempting the visit on Tuesdays and Thursdays and those four hours which the father would be deprived of would be compensated for by additional four hours on Saturday.

Learned counsel for the appellant submits that the security guard is consistently accompanying the child and does not even permit the child to be taken into the bed room or in the park. One may say the problem is the own making of the appellant by his past conduct.

Be that as it may, we would like to have a more facilitative arrangement as the father did redeem himself by coming back to India. Thus, once the child enters the house, the security guard can remain outside to give free interaction to the

child and the father and if the child is taken to a park, the guard can keep an eye but not come near the father and the child.

List for directions on 19.04.2022.

[CHARANJEET KAUR]  
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

[POONAM VAID]  
COURT MASTER (NSH)