

pending before the Bombay High Court in which notice is stated to have been issued and the Supreme Court also transferred the matters to the High Court on 13.07.2020.

In short, the grievance of the petitioner is that at the age of 79 she is unable to keep on facing adjournments. On 15 occasions, the daughter-in-law has managed an adjournment before the High Court while she continues to reside in the property of the petitioner and the relationship is such that the petitioner continues to feel threatened.

We find problematic to examine what kind of direction we issue to the High Court. The High Court is a Constitutional Court. It is the duty of the High Court to see that matters are taken up and decided. 15 adjournments can by no stretch of imagination said to constitute a reasonable indulgence to the parties. Normally, on a mere adjournment, we would loath to interfere but the number of adjournments granted require us to say something. We expect the High Court on the next date of hearing to bestow consideration on the matter and not permit any adjournment as a remedy cannot be made infructuous especially when the Supreme Court itself has transferred the matters to the High Court with the objective of an expeditious

disposal. We say no more but we think we have said enough.

The Special Leave Petition is disposed of.

Pending applications stand disposed of.

A copy of the order be placed before the Division Bench of the High Court.

[CHARANJEET KAUR]
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

[POONAM VAID]
COURT MASTER (NSH)