



\$~51

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

Date of decision: 21.07.2026

+ CM(M) 1533/2026, CM APPL. 45722/2026 (Stay), CM APPL. 45723/2026 (Ex.) & CM APPL. 45724/2026 (Delay of 40 days in Re-filing the petition)

SEEMA SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Deepak Sharma, Adv. with
Petitioner in person.

versus

DILAWAR SINGH

.....Respondent

Through:

CORAM:

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH VAIDYANATHAN
SHANKAR**

% **JUDGEMENT (Oral)**

1. The present Petition has been filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, 1950, assailing the **Order dated 18.03.2026**¹ passed by the learned **Family Court-03, District Shahdara, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi**², in HMA No. 82/2022 titled "*Dilawar Singh v. Seema Singh*", whereby the Petitioner's Application seeking leave to administer interrogatories came to be dismissed.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Petitioner submits that the learned Family Court has failed to appreciate that the proposed interrogatories are necessary for the just adjudication of the

¹ Impugned Order



disputes between the parties.

3. It is contended that the facts involved in the present proceedings are peculiar in nature and that denial of leave to administer interrogatories would seriously prejudice the Petitioner's case by depriving him of an effective opportunity to establish the relevant facts.

4. This Court has heard learned counsel for the Petitioner and perused the material placed on record, including the Impugned Order. The relevant observations of the learned Family Court in the Impugned Order are extracted hereinbelow:

“.....Heard the parties. Perused the record
A brief summary of the allegations and counter allegations made in the pleadings by the respective parties have been mentioned above. The Court is of the opinion that the petitioner cannot be compelled to answer to the interrogatories, as it is a matrimonial litigation and the questions proposed via the interrogatories are sensitive in nature. All such interrogatories ought to be put to the petitioner at the proper stage of cross-examination, and responses qua the same cannot be obtained via an interrogatory application. Accordingly, no ground made out to allow the present application. The same is dismissed.”

5. Upon consideration thereof, it is noted that the learned Family Court has considered the nature of the controversy between the parties and has recorded a categorical finding that, since the present litigation is matrimonial in nature, the issues sought to be addressed through interrogatories can adequately be elicited during the course of cross-examination.

6. Therefore, this Court finds no infirmity warranting interference in exercise of its supervisory jurisdiction under Article 227 of the Constitution of India. As it is well settled that the supervisory

² Family Court



jurisdiction under Article 227 is intended to keep subordinate Courts within the bounds of their jurisdiction and is not to be exercised as though this Court were sitting in appeal over every interlocutory order unless the order under challenge suffers from patent perversity, manifest illegality or jurisdictional error, interference would not be warranted.

7. In the present case, the discretion exercised by the learned Family Court in declining leave to administer interrogatories cannot be said to be arbitrary or perverse, as the Petitioner continues to have the opportunity to elicit the relevant facts through the process of cross-examination during trial and, therefore, no prejudice of such a nature is demonstrated as would justify interference under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

8. Accordingly, finding no merit in the present Petition, the same is dismissed.

9. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

HARISH VAIDYANATHAN SHANKAR, J.
JULY 21, 2026/v/jk