

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

C.M.P. No. 821 of 2025

1. Shalini Sinha, aged about 48 years, D/o. Late Satish Kant Sinha, Resident of Flat no. 101 A, Shree Baijnath Residency, Kusum Vihar, P.O. and P.S. Morabadi, District Ranchi.
2. Mukta Sinha, aged about 76 years, W/o. Late Satish Kant Sinha, R/o. Flat No.101-A, Shree Baijnath Residency, Kusum Vihar, P.O. & P.S. Morabadi, District Ranchi.

... Respondents/Petitioners

Versus

1. Anand Vikram, S/O Late Sh. Kaushal Kishore Sinha, permanent Resident of Nayatola, Bhikhanpur, Near Gumti no. 1, PO and PS – Bhikhanpur, PO Head Post office, PS – Isakchak, District – Bhagalpur, Bihar. PIN – 812001. And his present office Address – Anand Vikram, Senior Operation Manager, Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Pipelines Division, Eastern Regional Pipelines (ERPL), Construction Office Banka, LPG Bottling Plant, Village – Masudanpur, SH-19, Banka Bihar, PIN 813109.

Appellant/Opposite Party

2. Arya, Daughter o Anand Vikram, Resident of Flat No. 101-A, Shree Baijath Residence, Kusum Vihar, P.O. and P.S. Morabadi, District Ranchi.

... Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN**

For the Petitioners: Mr. P.P.N. Roy, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Pandey Ashok Nath Roy, Advocate
For the O.P. No.1: Mr. Lukesh Kumar, Advocate
For the O.P. No.2: Mr. Jyoti Prasad Sinha, Advocate

03/Dated: 24.02.2026

1. Heard Mr. P.P.N. Roy, learned Senior Counsel who appears with Mr. Pandey Ashok Nath Roy, learned counsel, for the petitioners; Mr. Lukesh Kumar, learned counsel, who appears for Opposite Party No.1 and, Mr. Jyoti Prasad Sinha, learned counsel, who appears for Opposite Party No.2.

2. This is an application seeking modification of our order dated 26.09.2022 made in First Appeal No.351 of 2017. The modification relates to the visitation rights granted to Opposite Party No.2, who is Arya and Sunidhi's father. The order grants the father's visitation rights once each month.

3. Now it is pointed out that Arya has attained majority and, therefore, the order granting the father visitation rights once each months should be modified.

4. Mr. Roy submitted that the matter should now be left to Arya's wish, since she has now attained majority.

5. We requested Arya to visit the Court so that we could ascertain her wishes. Arya stated that for the present she does not consider to continue with the arrangement which permits her father to visit her once each month. She has stated that she is studying in Delhi and she would not like to be disturbed presently.

6. Given that Arya is a major, we cannot disregard her wishes, though we got the distinct impression that she was being tutored by her mother, who is the custodial parent. However, tutoring or otherwise, considering that Arya is a major, we modify our earlier order dated 26.09.2022 and recall the order granting the father visitation rights to Arya once each month. There can be no compulsion on Arya to meet her father, and, therefore, it is only appropriate that we modify the order to the extent it concerns Arya. This is despite the fact that we felt it would be in the interest of both Arya and the father for there to be interaction between them at least

once each month. Such an interaction is necessary, particularly at this crucial stage in Arya's life. Unfortunately, Arya, possibly under her mother's tutelage, did not wish to continue with the arrangement recorded in the order dated 26.09.2022. Therefore, we modify/recall the visitation rights' order insofar as it concerns Arya.

7. Insofar as Sunidhi is concerned, she still is a minor, and there is no case made out to recall, vary, or even modify the order regarding the father's visitation rights to Sunidhi. Mr Rai submitted that the father does not visit the DLSA Office at Ranchi. This position was disputed by the learned counsel for the father, who complained about not receiving any proper intimation.

8. At this stage, we do not wish to investigate such allegations and counter-allegations. However, based on such allegations and counter-allegations, we are satisfied that no case is made out for varying the visitation rights' order so far as Sunidhi is concerned.

9. Mr. Rai submitted that we should modify the frequency of visitation from one visit per month to one visit per year. This submission cannot be accepted either. There is no case made out for such a variation. Such a variation, if granted, would virtually amount to recalling our entire order of 26.09.2022, because visitation for once a year was already granted by the Family Court, and this was enhanced once a month by this Court.

10. As the allegations and counter-allegations about the communication gap should not prevail, we direct that the father will be

entitled to visit Sunidhi at the DLSA Office, Ranchi, on the 2nd Sunday of each month, commencing from 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.

11. There will be no need to give special intimation. It shall be the responsibility of the mother, Shalini Sinha, to ensure that Sunidhi reports to the DLSA Centre, Ranchi, on the 2nd Sunday of every month at 11:00 a.m. After that, it will be her responsibility to pick up Sunidhi from the same place by 1:00 p.m.

12. In case there are any difficulties, such as exams or ill health, for Sunidhi, Shalini Sinha may apply to the Secretary of the DLSA for an exemption on that Sunday. However, exemption should not be granted as a matter of routine, because otherwise the order of this Court would be frustrated.

13. We also expect the father to act reasonably and not raise any unnecessary objections to visitation/access if he is seriously interested in it.

14. This petition for modification is disposed of in the above terms. No order for costs.

(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

February 24, 2026

N.A.F.R.

Manoj/ Sharda/Cp.2

Uploaded on 25.02.2026