

Family Law Judgments

A Monthly Wrap | July 2026



Title and Case details	Case Brief
Supreme Court: Maintenance Obligation Ends with Lump Sum Payment Vijayalakshmi R. vs. C.L. Balaji (MANU/SC/0722/2026; 2026 INSC 731)	The Supreme Court of India addressed whether Clause 9 of a settlement between Vijayalakshmi R. and C.L. Balaji constituted an independent obligation for ongoing maintenance payments after a lump sum was paid. The court found that Clauses 8, 9, and 10 formed a single arrangement, with Clause 9 being an interim measure that ceased upon payment of Rs. 1,00,00,000/-. The court affirmed the lower courts' findings that the obligation was satisfied and dismissed the appeal, rejecting the request for further maintenance or creation of a corpus for the son's education. The court noted the respondent's voluntary payment of Rs. 1,00,00,000/- for the son's education.
Delhi High Court Directs CARA to Issue NOC for Inter-Country Adoption Karnika Khandelwal vs. Union of India and Ors. (MANU/DE/4543/2026; 2026:DHC:5217)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the refusal by the Central Adoption Resource Authority (CARA) to issue a No Objection Certificate for the adoption of Karnika Khandelwal by her adoptive parents, due to non-compliance with Regulation 68 of the Adoption Regulations, 2022. The court noted that Australian authorities classify such adoptions as "expatriate adoptions," which are not recognized under Australian law, complicating compliance. Citing precedents from the Bombay and Gujarat High Courts, the court directed CARA to issue the NOC following an inquiry by the District Magistrate, emphasizing the child's welfare. The petition was disposed of with these instructions.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi High Court Orders Sealing of Intimate Photos Filed in Divorce Case Ramandeep Kaur vs. Harsh Oberoi and Ors. (MANU/DE/4534/2026; 2026:DHC:5224)	The High Court of Delhi addressed a contempt petition filed by Ramandeep Kaur against Harsh Oberoi and his advocates for breaching privacy guidelines by filing intimate photographs in a divorce petition without court approval. The court noted the respondents' lack of awareness of prior privacy directions and accepted their unconditional apology, while expressing strong disapproval of their actions. The court directed the Family Court to secure the confidentiality of the proceedings by sealing the offending documents and anonymizing the petitioner's identity. The petition was disposed of with instructions to prevent further dissemination of the sensitive material.
Delhi High Court Quashes Dowry Harassment FIR After Settlement Between Parties Ajay Sharma and Ors. vs. The State (Govt. of NCT of Delhi) and Ors. (MANU/DE/4501/2026; 2026:DHC:5261)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the petition by Ajay Sharma and others seeking to quash FIR No. 142/2022 related to charges under Sections 406, 498A, 34 IPC, and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, following a compromise with the complainant, respondent no.2. The court noted that the State had no objection, and respondent no.2 confirmed the settlement and dissolution of marriage, with custody of their son granted to her. Satisfied that a trial was unnecessary; the court quashed the FIR and related proceedings.
Delhi High Court Orders Return of Child to Canada, Upholds Canadian Custody Order Karan Chopra vs. State and Ors. (MANU/DE/4664/2026; 2026:DHC:5286)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of the custody of a minor child, in a dispute between Karan Chopra and Ashu Chopra. The court considered the welfare of the child as paramount, noting that the child was taken to India by Ashu Chopra in violation of a Canadian court order granting temporary custody to Karan Chopra. The court emphasized the importance of the doctrine of comity of courts and the need to respect foreign judicial determinations. It ordered the return of the child to Canada within six weeks, allowing Ashu Chopra the option to accompany the child, and directed compliance with the Canadian court's order. The petition was disposed of with no order as to costs.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Delhi High Court Rejects Pension Claim Over Unproved Customary Divorce Kamlesh vs. New Delhi Municipal Council (MANU/DE/4868/2026; 2026:DHC:5606-DB)	The High Court of Delhi addressed the issue of Kamlesh seeking transfer of her deceased mother's family pension from the New Delhi Municipal Council, claiming a customary divorce under Khatik caste customs. The court found that Kamlesh failed to provide legal proof of a valid divorce, as required under Rule 54 of the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules 1972 and Section 29(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act. The court upheld the Central Administrative Tribunal's decision, dismissing the petition but allowed Kamlesh to reapply if she could legally establish a valid customary divorce, referencing precedents like Sanjana Kumari v. Vijay Kumar. The writ petition was disposed of accordingly.
Orissa High Court: Transfer of Matrimonial Case to Cuttack Allowed for Wife's Convenience and Safety Lipsa Nayak vs. Satyajit Rout (MANU/OR/0825/2026)	The High Court of Orissa addressed a transfer petition filed by Lipsa Nayak seeking to move the proceedings in C.P. No. 873 of 2025 from the Family Court-II, Bhubaneswar to the Family Court, Cuttack, citing personal safety concerns and logistical difficulties. The court considered the convenience of the wife, as established in the precedent of <i>N.C. V. Aishwarya Vs. A.S. Saravana Karthik Sha</i>, and allowed the transfer, directing the Bhubaneswar court to transmit the case to Cuttack within seven days. The court emphasized the need for a speedy trial and permitted virtual appearances to accommodate the parties' circumstances.
Uttarakhand High Court: Criminal Proceedings Under Sections 498A/323/504 IPC Quashed on Basis of Amicable Settlement Sanjay Dabral vs. State of Uttarakhand and Ors. (MANU/UC/0265/2026; 2026:UHC:5312)	The High Court of Uttarakhand addressed the application by Sanjay Dabral seeking to quash criminal proceedings against him under Sections 498A, 323, and 504 of the IPC, following an amicable settlement with his wife, the respondent. The court noted that the parties had mutually divorced, with the respondent receiving alimony and expressing no interest in pursuing the case. Citing the Supreme Court's precedent in <i>Ruchi Agarwal v. Amit Kumar Agrawal</i>, the court found continuing the proceedings would be an abuse of process. Consequently, the court allowed the application, quashing the charge-sheet, cognizance order, and related proceedings.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Jharkhand High Court Upholds Rejection of Husband's Divorce Plea Rajhans vs. Sarita Kumari Singh (MANU/JH/1067/2026; 2026:JHHC:20908-DB)	The High Court of Jharkhand addressed an appeal by Rajhans challenging the Family Court's dismissal of his divorce petition against Sarita Kumari Singh on grounds of cruelty and desertion. The court found that Rajhans failed to prove allegations of cruelty and desertion, noting evidence of his relationship with another woman, Usha Kumari, which contradicted his claims. The Family Court's decision was upheld, and the appeal was dismissed, affirming that the judgment did not suffer from any legal perversity.
Madhya Pradesh High Court Directs Reconsideration of Maintenance Plea Jagannath Soni vs. Munnibai (MANU/MP/3707/2026; 2026:MPHC-JBP:51396)	The High Court of Madhya Pradesh addressed a criminal revision filed by Jagannath Soni challenging the Family Court's order granting Munnibai, his wife, Rs. 10,000 per month as maintenance under Section 125 Cr.P.C. The core dispute involved whether a second application for maintenance was maintainable given a prior order and an ex parte divorce decree on adultery grounds. The court found that the Family Court erred in not considering the res judicata effect of the previous maintenance order and the divorce decree. Consequently, the case was remanded for reconsideration, with directions for the Family Court to reassess the application under Section 125 Cr.P.C., while maintaining interim maintenance payments of Rs. 4,000 per month.
Punjab and Haryana High Court Dismisses Protection Plea by Live-In Couple Over Procedural Lapse Raj Kaur and Ors. vs. State of Punjab and Ors. (MANU/PH/3603/2026; 2026:PHHC:088501)	The High Court of Punjab and Haryana addressed a petition filed by Raj Kaur and others seeking protection for their lives and liberty due to threats from private respondents, in the context of a live-in relationship where one partner is already married. The court referenced the precedent set in <i>Yashpal v. State of Haryana</i>, which requires petitioners in such situations to first approach the District Legal Services Authority or State Human Rights Commission before seeking court intervention. As the petitioners did not follow this procedure, the court dismissed the petition as not maintainable, allowing them to pursue remedies with the appropriate authorities.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Uttarakhand High Court: Sentences Under 498-A/304-B/120-B IPC Ordered to Run Concurrently Devendra Singh vs. State of Uttarakhand and Ors. (MANU/UC/0269/2026)	The High Court of Uttarakhand addressed whether the sentences imposed on Devendra Singh should run concurrently or consecutively, as the sentencing order did not specify this. Devendra Singh, convicted under Sections 498-A, 304-B, and 120-B IPC, argued for concurrent sentences, having already served over seven years. The court, referencing Section 31 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and the precedent set in <i>Gagan Kumar v. State of Punjab</i>, determined that in the absence of specific directions, sentences should run concurrently. Consequently, the court ordered the jail authorities to treat the sentences as concurrent, effectively granting Singh's release.
Uttarakhand High Court Dismisses Plea to Stay UCC Proceedings Based on Triple Talaq Suit Shakir Mohammad Ali vs. Malika Saheen (MANU/UC/0281/2026; 2026:UHC:5348-DB)	The High Court of Uttarakhand addressed an appeal by Shakir Mohammad Ali against Malika Saheen, challenging the rejection of his application to dismiss or stay proceedings in a suit filed by Saheen under the Uniform Civil Code, Uttarakhand, 2024. Ali argued that a prior suit he filed in Saharanpur, claiming dissolution of marriage via triple talaq, should prevent the new suit due to res sub judice. The court dismissed the appeal, citing the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Shayara Bano v. Union of India</i>, which invalidated triple talaq, rendering Ali's earlier suit unsustainable. The court found no merit in Ali's appeal and dismissed it.
Allahabad High Court: Divorce Does Not Bar Domestic Violence Proceedings Puneet Rastogi vs. State of U.P. and Ors. (MANU/UP/1499/2026; 2026:AHC-LKO:43629)	The High Court of Allahabad addressed the issue of whether Puneet Rastogi's application to quash a domestic violence complaint filed by Pratima Rastogi was valid, given their divorce. The court considered the legal context of the Domestic Violence Act, 2005, which allows for claims even after divorce if the alleged violence occurred during the marriage. The court referenced precedents, including <i>Inderjit Singh Grewal</i> and <i>Prabha Tyagi</i>, affirming that a domestic relationship persists in post-divorce for the purposes of the Act. The court dismissed Puneet Rastogi's application, allowing domestic violence to continue.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Bombay High Court Upholds Cancellation of Gift Deed for Son's Failure to Care for Parents Ashwin Ramesh Soni vs. Ramesh Bachaulal Soni and Ors. (MANU/MH/5225/2026)	The High Court of Bombay addressed a dispute between Ashwin Ramesh Soni and his parents, Ramesh Bachaulal Soni and others, concerning the cancellation of a gift deed for a flat under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007. The court upheld the Tribunal's decision to void the gift deed for the Yashashree flat, as the petitioner failed to fulfill the condition of providing care to his parents, which was the basis of the gift. The court found no merit in the petitioner's claims and dismissed the writ petition, instructing compliance with the Tribunal's order.
Karnataka High Court Acquits Man in Wife's Death Case, Cites Lack of Reliable Evidence Nagaraja U.D. vs. State of Karnataka (MANU/KA/2102/2026; CRL.A No.150 of 2019)	The High Court of Karnataka addressed the appeal by Nagaraja U.D. against his conviction for offenses under Sections 498A, 302, 304-B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, related to the death of his wife, Sarita. The court found that the prosecution failed to prove the accused's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, particularly questioning the reliability of the dying declaration and the lack of evidence regarding the demand for dowry. Consequently, the court set aside the trial court's conviction and ordered Nagaraja's acquittal, directing his immediate release unless required in another case.
Andhra Pradesh High Court directs compliance with BNSS arrest safeguards Shaik Shaharoz and Ors. vs. The State of Andhra Pradesh (MANU/AP/1102/2026; APHC010315882026)	The High Court of Andhra Pradesh addressed a petition by Shaik Shaharoz and others seeking pre-arrest bail in a case involving alleged offenses under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and the Dowry Prohibition Act. The court emphasized that the offenses were punishable with imprisonment of less than seven years, invoking precedents from the Supreme Court, including <i>Arnesh Kumar v. State of Bihar</i>, which discourage unnecessary arrests for such offenses. The court directed the Investigating Officer to comply with Section 35(3) of the BNSS and follow guidelines from relevant Supreme Court cases, while allowing the officer to proceed according to law if offenses warranting higher punishment are discovered. The petition was disposed of with these directions.

Title and Case details	Case Brief
Jharkhand High Court: Divorce Plea Fails as Cruelty, Desertion Not Proved Mukesh Kr. Ray vs. Bindu Kumari (MANU/JH/1021/2026; 2026:JHHC:20016-DB)	The High Court of Jharkhand addressed an appeal by Mukesh Kr. Ray against Bindu Kumari, challenging the Family Court's dismissal of his divorce petition on grounds of cruelty and desertion under the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. The court found that Mukesh failed to prove cruelty or desertion by Bindu, noting that the marriage was not void and that Bindu's actions were not voluntary desertion but due to compelling circumstances. The court upheld the Family Court's decision, dismissing the appeal and finding no perversity in the judgment.
Allahabad High Court Directs Speedy Decision on Mutual Divorce Plea Pooja Prajapati vs. Ravish Kumar (MANU/UP/1570/2026; 2026:AHC:140350)	The High Court of Allahabad addressed the issue of expeditious disposal of a divorce petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act filed by Pooja Prajapati against Ravish Kumar. The court emphasized the discretion to waive the statutory cooling-off period if conditions are met, as outlined in the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Amardeep Singh v. Harveen Kaur</i>. The court directed the parties to file an application to waive the cooling period, instructing the lower court to decide on this application within three weeks and, if waived, to resolve the divorce petition within one month. The writ petition was disposed of with these directions.
Orissa High Court Affirms Enhanced Maintenance for Aggrieved Wife Saurav Raiguru vs. Ananya Mishra (MANU/OR/0874/2026; CRLREV No.627 of 2025)	The High Court of Orissa addressed the dispute between Saurav Raiguru and Ananya Mishra regarding interim maintenance under the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005. Ananya Mishra sought maintenance from her husband, Saurav Raiguru, claiming financial hardship after leaving her matrimonial home due to alleged domestic violence. The court upheld the Appellate Court's decision to increase interim maintenance from Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 30,000 per month and maintained the house rent at Rs. 10,000 per month, dismissing both parties' appeals for further adjustments. The court emphasized the husband's obligation to provide for his wife and child, referencing the Supreme Court's stance in <i>Rajnish v. Neha</i> and <i>Rinku Baheti v. Sandesh Sharda</i>.