

# Vermeet Singh Taneja vs Jasmeet Kaur on 7 April, 2025

**Author: Navin Chawla**

**Bench: Navin Chawla**

\$~123

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Date of decision: 07.04.2025

CONT.CAS(C) 534/2025 & CM APPL. 20478/2025

VERMEET SINGH TANEJA .....Petitioner

Through: Ms.Preeti Singh, Mr.S.Porwal,  
Ms.Shefali, Ms.Sakshi Trivedi,  
Ms.Ayushi Kumari, Advs.  
along with petitioner in person.

versus

JASMEET KAUR

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anshuman Gargesh,  
Mr.Pradeep Kumar, Advs.  
along with respondent in  
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE RENU BHATNAGAR

NAVIN CHAWLA, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971, complaining that the respondent has violated the Order dated 07.05.2024 passed by this Court in MAT.APP. (F.C.)155/2024, titled Vermeet Singh Taneja v. Jasmeet Kaur.

2. By the above order, this Court had disposed of the appeal filed by the appellant herein, by observing and directing as under:

"4. Ms Preeti Singh, learned counsel, who appears on behalf of the appellant/husband, submits that the appellant/husband would be satisfied if the child is not shifted from the school in which he is presently admitted in i.e., Prudence School, Pitampura and he is given a say in case the respondent/wife decides to change the child's school once again.

5. Mr Satish Singhal, learned counsel, who appears on behalf of the respondent/wife, says that the respondent will abide by any such direction issued by the Court.

6. Accordingly, the appeal is disposed of with a direction that in future, the decision with regard to the child's school will be taken jointly. 6.1 In the event the couple is unable to arrive at a mutually agreed decision, the Court will evaluate the matter on merits and take a decision in the best interest of the child."

3. The complaint of the petitioner is that in spite of the above order, wherein, we directed that any change of school of the child, who is only 9 years old, shall be taken by mutual agreement of the parties, the petitioner was not consulted before changing the school of the child from Prudence School, Pitampura to Maxfort International School, Rohini.

4. The learned counsel for the respondent, who appears on an advance notice of this petition, submits that the school of the child was changed as the respondent had shifted her job to the said school that is, Maxfort International School, Rohini. He further submits that the Prudence School was only till Class 5<sup>th</sup>, while the present School, that is, Maxfort International School, Rohini is till 12<sup>th</sup> standard.

5. He further submits that the respondent had consulted the petitioner before changing the school, however, the petitioner did not come out with any appropriate alternate option for the school, and is only intending to gain custody of the child.

6. We have considered the submissions made by the learned counsels for the parties.

7. Though, repeated change of school of the child can be detrimental to his mental health and also educational growth, as the respondent has already shifted the child now to Maxfort International School, Rohini, we do not deem it appropriate to proceed further with the present petition. However, we direct that as the present school is till 12<sup>th</sup> standard, the respondent shall now not shift the school of the child, for any reason whatsoever, without obtaining the permission of the learned Family Court.

8. The petition alongwith the pending application is accordingly disposed of.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J RENU BHATNAGAR, J APRIL 7, 2025 RN/VS Click here to check corrigendum, if any