



\$~84

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

+ W.P.(C) 5743/2025
ASHOK KHANNA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Kumar Choudhary, Mr.
Anurag Yadav, Mr. Sandeep Pandey
and Mr. Aditya Anand Singh, Advs.

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT) OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Nitika Bhutani, Adv. for R-1 and
2.
Mr. Rakesh Kumar and Mr. Achin
Goel, Advs. for R-3 (through v/c)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

% **01.05.2025**

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner, a senior citizen raising a grievance that the proceedings initiated by the petitioner under Section 22 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007, which are pending before the District Magistrate, Delhi-West, are not being conducted in an expeditious manner. It is submitted that such a delay has caused grave prejudice to the petitioner.
2. The petition narrates the immense harassment being suffered by the petitioner (a 73 year old senior citizen, suffering from paralysis which has affected almost his entire body) at the hands of the respondent nos.3 and 4. The said narration, if true, reveals a highly disturbing state of affairs.
3. The limited relief sought by the petitioner is that the concerned District Magistrate be directed to decide the petitioner's complaint



expeditiously.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent nos.1 and 2 accedes to the said prayer. It is stated that the District Magistrate, Delhi-West shall bestow urgent consideration to the matter and endeavour to decide the same as expeditiously as possible. For this purpose, requisite hearing shall be scheduled at short intervals. It is further submitted that an endeavour shall be made to decide the matter within a period of six weeks from today.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Prayer-(b)¹ sought in the present petition shall be pressed before the concerned District Magistrate. Let the same be duly considered by the District Magistrate.

6. The petition is disposed of, in the above terms.

7. It is made clear that this order shall not be construed as an expression of opinion of this Court on the merits of the controversy.

SACHIN DATTA, J

MAY 1, 2025/cl

¹“b) pass an order directing the Respondent no. 2 to direct the Respondents 3 & 4 to return the property papers back to the Petitioner.”