



\$~1 to 3, 34 to 36

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

+ LPA 727/2025, CM APPL. 75559/2025 & CM APPL. 75560/2025

HETALI ENTERPRISES & ANR.

.....Appellants

Through: Mr. Robin Jaisinghani, Ms. Jacinta D'
Silva and Mr. Bhaskar Nayak,
Advocates.

versus

DR. VIJAY PURUSHOTTAM KALE

.....Respondent

Through:

(2)

+ LPA 728/2025, CM APPL. 75563/2025 & CM APPL. 75564/2025

HETALI ENTERPRISES & ANR.

.....Appellants

Through: Mr. Robin Jaisinghani, Ms. Jacinta D'
Silva and Mr. Bhaskar Nayak,
Advocates.

versus

DR. SATISHCHANDRA P KALE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through:

(3)

+ LPA 729/2025, CM APPL. 75566/2025 & CM APPL. 75567/2025

HETALI ENTERPRISES & ANR.

.....Appellants

Through: Mr. Robin Jaisinghani, Ms. Jacinta D'
Silva and Mr. Bhaskar Nayak,
Advocates.

versus

DR. PURUSHOTTAM G. KALE

.....Respondent

Through:

(34)

+ LPA 750/2025, CM APPL. 77577/2025, CM APPL. 77578/2025 & CM
APPL. 77579/2025

HETALI ENTERPRISES

.....Appellant

Through: Mr. Robin Jaisinghani, Ms. Jacinta D'
Silva and Mr. Bhaskar Nayak,
Advocates.



versus
DR. PURUSHOTTAM G. KALERespondent
Through:

(35)

+ LPA 751/2025, CM APPL. 77582/2025, CM APPL. 77583/2025 & CM APPL. 77584/2025

HETALI ENTERPRISESAppellant
Through: Mr. Robin Jaisinghani, Ms. Jacinta D' Silva and Mr. Bhaskar Nayak, Advocates.

versus

DR SATISHCHANDRA PURUSHOTTAM KALE.....Respondent
Through:

(36)

+ LPA 752/2025, CM APPL. 77594/2025, CM APPL. 77595/2025 & CM APPL. 77596/2025

HETALI ENTERPRISESAppellant
Through: Mr. Robin Jaisinghani, Ms. Jacinta D' Silva and Mr. Bhaskar Nayak, Advocates.

versus

DR. VIJAY PURUSHOTTAM KALERespondent
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TUSHAR RAO GEDELA

ORDER
09.12.2025

%

1. Heard the learned counsel for the appellant.
2. These appeals have been preferred taking exception to an order dated 16.10.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge. In fact, the order impugned herein is only an interlocutory order passed on an application preferred by the appellants for early hearing of the writ petition.



3. It has been stated by learned counsel for the appellants that on such an application, the observation made by learned Single Judge in the impugned order to the effect that the appellants were not able to make out a *prima facie* case for grant of interim relief, was unwarranted and therefore, the same may be struck off.

4. However, what we find from perusal of the impugned order is that the learned Single Judge while observing that the appellants had failed to make out a *prima facie* case for grant of interim relief, has, in the same breath, also observed that the appellants shall be entitled to make appropriate submissions on the next date of hearing already fixed in the writ petitions. Such observation made by learned Single Judge would necessarily mean that any observation regarding the appellants having failed to make out the *prima facie* case for grant of interim relief will not come in the way of learned Single Judge to decide the writ petitions on their own merits.

5. At this juncture, learned counsel for the appellants has prayed that some observation may be made for early disposal of the writ petitions.

6. Having regard to the overall facts and circumstances of the case and without interfering in the impugned order, we only request the learned Single Judge to expedite the proceedings of the writ petitions and conclude the same at an early date, and if possible by preponing the date already fixed. The appeals stand disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

7. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ

TUSHAR RAO GEDELA, J

DECEMBER 9, 2025

kct