



2025:DHC:4342-DB



\$~25

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

Date of decision: 23.05.2025

+ MAT.APP.(F.C.) 194/2025

SH. HONEY SHARMAAppellant
Through: Mr.R.S. Juneja, Mr.Shiv
Kumar, Advs.

versus

SMT. NEHA GOEL SHARMARespondent
Through: Nemo

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (ORAL)

CM APPL. 32173/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

MAT.APP.(F.C.) 194/2025 & CM APPL. 32172/2025

2. This appeal has been filed by the appellant, challenging the Order dated 16.04.2025 passed by the learned Family Court-03, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi, (hereinafter referred to as, 'Family Court') in HMA No. 1146/2020, titled *Sh. Honey Sharma v. Smt. Neha Goel Sharma*, dismissing the application filed by the appellant herein seeking recall of the Order dated 24.04.2024, by which his right to cross-examine the respondent was closed.



3. The learned counsel for the appellant submits that the earlier counsel for the appellant was taking adjournments without the knowledge of the appellant. He submits that subsequently, counsel appointed by the DLSA also took undue time to process the application and enter an appearance, because of which the cross-examination of the respondent could not take place. He submits that at least one opportunity be granted to the appellant to cross-examine the witness. He undertakes that such cross-examination will be conducted within a day. He submits that an opportunity be also granted to the appellant to lead his own evidence.

4. We are not impressed by the submission made by the learned counsel for the appellant. The Impugned Order passed by the learned Family Court records the complete history of the progress of the case, and notes that the appellant has made a mockery of the Court system by taking repeated adjournments, even though cost had been imposed upon him. The intent of the appellant clearly is only to delay the adjudication of the petition filed by the respondent seeking divorce from the appellant.

5. We find the application seeking recall of the Order dated 24.04.2024 had been filed only on 11.02.2025, that is, almost a year thereafter. The appellant is an educated person and has studied LLB. He clearly knows the ways of the Court and, unfortunately, even how to delay the adjudication of the petition filed by the respondent. The plea taken today by the learned counsel for the appellant is yet another attempt on his part to delay the adjudication.

6. We, therefore, find no merits in the present appeal. The same is,



2025:DHC:4342-DB



accordingly, dismissed. The pending application is also dismissed, being infructuous.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

RENU BHATNAGAR, J

MAY 23, 2025/Arya/DG

Click here to check corrigendum, if any