

\$~41

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

+ **CM(M) 1032/2017**

**VINAY GUPTA**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. P. Banerjee & Mr. Raghu  
Tandon, Advs.

Versus

**SAVERI NAYAK**

..... Respondent

Through: None.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW**

**ORDER**

% **18.09.2017**

**CM No.34110/2017 (for exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. The application is disposed of.

**CM(M) 1032/2017**

3. This petition under Article 227 of the Constitution of India seeks a direction to the Family Court, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi for expeditious disposal of Guardianship Petition No.32/2016 titled "Vinay Gupta Vs. Saveri Nayak".
4. The Guardianship Petition of which expeditious disposal is sought was instituted on 11<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 and there is nothing to show that the petitioner, in the matter of getting dates of hearing before the Court, is being treated unfairly.
5. Though I am of the view that a litigant, only because of having the resources to approach the High Court for a direction for expeditious disposal, is not entitled to any priority in hearing before the Courts within the supervisory jurisdiction of the High Court but in the facts, all that

can be observed / directed is, that the Family Court, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi before which the petition aforesaid is pending, keeping in mind the facts of the present case may consider, without prejudicing other cases of similar facts, giving dates on priority in the subject petition.

6. With the aforesaid, the petition is disposed of.

**RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J**

**SEPTEMBER 18, 2017**

‘gsr’..