



\$~53

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

+ **W.P.(C) 8115/2025**

DR. ROOPA VOHRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Seema Singh, Adv. along with
petitioner in person.

versus

MEENA JAIN & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Dhruv Rohatgi, Ms. Chandrika
Sachdev and Mr. Dhruv Kumar,
Advs. for GNCTD.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

ORDER

%

30.05.2025

CM APPL.35459/2025 (Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 8115/2025

3. The petitioner has filed the present petition, *inter alia*, praying as under –

“a) To pass Order Issuance of writ of certiorari and or mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or appropriate directions for petitioner seeking To place all original documents- on alleged PIQ purchase in question dated 27-08-2013 as per List of xerox documents under 'Annexure P30 dated 28-10-2017' submitted in ADJ-II Court to first factually prove legal maintainability of alleged purchase of PIQ with all Original Documents on or before 30 days.;

b) To pass Order issuance of writ of certiorari and or mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or appropriate directions seeking to place affidavit of respondents bearing their legible name on xerox documents listed under 'annexure dated 28-10-2017' to factually decide the legal maintainability of xerox documents with all original documents on



alleged purchase piq (property in question)/suit property dated 27-08-2013 on or before 30 days

c) To pass Order issuance of writ of certiorari and or mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or appropriate directions seeking to place Entire Investigation report on Complaint allotted No 801012352521 dt 03-11-2023 based on communication with Police Commissioner & Completed dt 19-04-2024 to be supplied forthwith to Petitioner.”

4. The petitioner, Dr. Roopa Vohra, is the daughter and legal heir of Late Smt. Kailash Vohra, who was the original petitioner in Probate Case No. 50443/2016, instituted on 10.09.2014 before the Concerned District Court. Upon the demise of her mother on 01.06.2023, the petitioner, as her legal heir, is presently pursuing the said probate proceedings.

5. It is noticed that the instant writ petition is an offshoot of the issues being agitated in the probate proceedings; the petitioner seeks directions that are substantially linked to the evidence and pleadings pending before the concerned District Court.

6. At the outset, this Court is of the considered view that the petitioner has not made out a case warranting the exercise of this Court's extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, particularly when concerned District Court is duly vested with jurisdiction to determine all factual and legal disputes, including those pertaining to the admissibility and veracity of documents.

7. It has also been brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner has already filed a similar application before the concerned District Court under Order XI Rules 1 and 14 read with Section 151 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908, seeking interrogatories and production of certain original documents. The relevant extract of the petition is reproduced as under -



“8. That the similar Application has been filed to under Order XI rule 1 & 14 R/W 151 CPC , 1908 seeking for examination of Interrogatories for examination of the Respondent No.3 herein to deliver the same and produce the Original documents in Original in Affidavit filed on 18.03.2025, however before the Ld. Trial Court very cleverly Respondent No. 1-3 by passess or take adjournment or cross examination is deferred for production of Original Documents and neither any Notice is issued upon the present Application before the Ld. Trial Court and the Petitioner will withdraw once the Petition is allowed and the Documents as mentioned in above Para AB is produced in Original Before the Hon'ble Court and the Documents are deposited into custody of the Present Hon'ble Court or before the Ld. Trial Court in Probate Proceedings so that Original Documents be sent for FSL.”

8. Having considered the submissions and the nature of reliefs sought, this Court is of the opinion that no interference is warranted under Article 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India. However, it is deemed apposite to direct the concerned District Court to decide any application of the petitioner in accordance with law, by way of a reasoned order, as expeditiously as possible.

9. The present writ petition is disposed of in the above terms.

SACHIN DATTA, J

MAY 30, 2025/cl