\$~10

*

%

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ W.P.(C) 8615/2020 & CM No.27770/2020 (for exemption) OMAR ABDULLAH Petitioner

Through Ms.Malvika Rajkotia, Adv. with Mr.Ramakant Sharma, Adv.

versus

REGISTRAR GENERAL HIGH COURT NEW DELHI & ANR. Res

Through

..... Respondents Ms.Meenal Duggal, Adv. for Mr.Viraj R. Datar, Adv. for R-1. Mr.Jayant K. Sood, Sr. Adv. with Mr.Randeep Sachdeva, Adv., Mr.Honey Khanna, Adv. & Mr.Harish Nadda, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD <u>O R D E R</u> 03.11.2020

HEARD THROUGH VIDEO CONFERENCING

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying *inter alia* that the Office order dated 26.04.2020, issued by the Registrar General of the High Court, which requires a consent from the other side before moving the court with an application for final hearing of matters that are ripe for arguments, be modified.

2. Ms.Rajkotia, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the Office order dated 26.04.2020, ought to be modified because there is a scope of its misuse as has happened in the present case, where the respondent No.2 has declined to give her consent for final hearing of MAT.APP.(FC) No.135 of

W.P.(C) 8615/2020

Page 1 of 2

WWW.LIVELAW.IN

2016 filed by the petitioner, which was admitted for final hearing vide order dated 01.02.2017, passed by a Division Bench of this court.

3. Refusal on the part of the respondent No.2 to give her consent for an early hearing of the pending appeal can hardly be a ground for this court to interfere in the Office order dated 26.04.2020.

4. Mr.Sood, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the respondent No.2 states on instructions that the file of the appeal being as voluminous as it is, neither the respondent nor her counsel on record are comfortable with a virtual hearing of the matter. This aspect will not engage this court in the present matter as the scope of the petition is confined only to the Office order dated 26.04.2020, which in our opinion, does not warrant any modification.

5. The present petition is, accordingly, dismissed in *limine* as meritless along with the application.

HIMA KOHLI, J

SUBRAMONIUM PRASAD, J

NOVEMBER 3, 2020 aa/rkb

W.P.(C) 8615/2020

Page 2 of 2