

\$~31

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CM(M) 325/2016**
HARJIT SINGH ANAND

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Satish K.Sansi, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR

..... Respondents

Through Nemo.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE INDERMEET KAUR

ORDER
% **05.04.2016**

C.M. No.12725/2016 (exemption)

Exemption is allowed subject to just exceptions. Application disposed of.

CM(M) 325/2016 & C.M.No.12724/2016 (stay)

Petitioner is aggrieved by two orders i.e. the order dated 20.01.2016 and the subsequent order dated 08.3.2016. Respondent evidence stood closed by the second impugned order.

Record shows that in the probate petition which is pending the objector/respondent no.3/petitioner had filed objections. The impugned order dated 20.01.2016 recorded the facts. It has noted that since on 15.12.2014 several opportunities had been granted to the petitioner to lead evidence. On an earlier date cost of Rs.2000/- was already imposed. Six opportunities having been granted to the petitioner but he not having availed the said opportunities and

thereafter moving an application seeking waiver of the cost which was declined by the order dated 20.01.2016 in fact reflects upon the conduct of the petitioner. All along he has been trying to delay the proceedings. As on that date i.e. on 20.01.2016 another application has been filed by him for recalling the order dated 23.9.2014; meaning thereby the petitioner was seeking recall of an order which had been passed 1½ years ago. The factual matrix as noted in the aforementioned order reflects on the conduct of the petitioner which is not only lackadaisical but negligent. Such a petitioner deserves little sympathy from this Court. The Courts cannot be taken for granted. The impugned orders in this background suffer from no infirmity. Petition dismissed.

INDERMEET KAUR, J

APRIL 05, 2016

ndn