



\$~88

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of Decision : 21.05.2026**+ **CONT.CAS(C) 167/2025**

SARA CARRIERE DUBEY

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Priya Hingorani (Sr. Adv) along
with Mr. Naseem Ahmed, Ms. Aditi
Ladda, Advs.

versus

ASHISH DUBEY

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anunaya Mehta, Adv. along with
Respondent-In Person**CORAM:****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA****SACHIN DATTA, J. (ORAL)**

1. *Vide* order dated 16.01.2026, passed in the present proceedings, it was ordered as under:-

1. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that the respondent is in flagrant violation of the directions contained in the order dated 08.10.2021 passed in Guardianship Petition (GP 15/2019) by the Family Court, South District, Saket New Delhi. The operative directions, which admittedly still continue to be in subsistence are as under:-

10. I have l.d. Counsel for the parties. In my opinion, allowing/introducing the minor children to 'X' would be detrimental to their mental well-being and growth. The application has merit. Ashish is restrained from making the minor children meet 'X' during the visitation meetings granted to him *vide* order dated 21.1.2020. Ashish is further directed to desist from violating the visitation order dated 21.1.2020 in its letter and spirit. Ashish shall further make sure that whenever the children visit his house at Asied Games Complex, New Delhi or at any other public place or residence with him, 'X' should not be there. The application stands disposed of.

2. Learned counsel for the respondent has sought to contend that interaction between the children and X, although interdicted by the order



dated 08.10.2021, may have taken place at the behest of the children themselves. Such a contention cannot be countenanced. Paragraph-10 of the said order passed by the Family Court, clearly indicates that allowing/introducing the minor children to X would be detrimental to their mental well-being and growth.

3. Clearly, the respondent has to take responsibility if the minor children interact with X during the course the respondent exercising his visitation rights. In terms of the directions contained in Paragraph-10 of the aforesaid order dated 08.10.2021, it is incumbent upon the respondent to ensure that there is no interaction between the minor children and X.

4. The respondent cannot be absolved of his obligation on the basis of the plea that the children have voluntarily sought to contact X. It is made clear that during the visitation between the respondent and the children, the minor children should not be exposed to X at all. This is in terms of the express directions issued by the Family Court, which, as noted above, continue to subsist.

5. List for further consideration on 16.04.2026.

2. Today, it is submitted by learned senior counsel for the petitioner that the above directions were not complied with, inasmuch as there were multiple occasions where the minor children were brought into direct contact with X during the visitation between the respondent and the children, even after the aforesaid order came to be passed. The same is, however, strenuously refuted by the respondent who is present in person.

3. Be that as it may, the respondent, who is present in person, unequivocally undertakes that under no circumstances will the minor children be brought into any contact whatsoever with X. It is further undertaken that when the children are residing with/ visiting the respondent in terms of the extant order/s passed by the Family Court, the respondent



2026:DHC:4806



shall ensure that X does not visit the premises.

4. It is agreed that if there is any breach of the aforesaid undertaking and if there is any contact whatsoever, between the children and X, the same shall be construed as wilful and egregious breach of the undertaking given to this Court, entailing severe action under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

5. Needless to say, the same shall be subject to rights of the respondent to seek appropriate orders/ modification from the concerned Family Court. The same shall be considered on its own merits.

6. In the light of the aforesaid, no further orders are required to be passed in the present petition. The same is accordingly disposed of taking on record the aforesaid undertaking.

SACHIN DATTA, J

MAY 21, 2026/uk