



\$~40

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

+ **RFA 194/2025**

VATEENA BEGUM

.....Appellant

Through: Mohd. Azam Ansari, Advocate.

versus

SHAMIM ZAFAR & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: None.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

%

06.03.2025

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

CM APPL. 13518/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

REVIEW PET. 145/2025

2. In this review application, I heard learned counsel for the appellant/review applicant for 10 minutes. At that stage, I offered him to address further arguments if desired at the end of the board, because this is the first matter today and the list runs into 57 matters. But learned counsel for review applicant submits that he cannot appear at the end of the board since he has to appear before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. That being so, learned counsel for review applicant submitted that he may be heard for another few minutes. Accordingly, I have heard him further and he closes his preliminary submissions on this review application.

3. By way of this application, the appellant has sought review of order dated 04.03.2025.



4. This order cannot be read *de hors* order dated 04.03.2025.
5. The present review application mentions copy paste of all grounds of appeal; non recording of two arguments; and sermons on bar and bench relationship.
6. No doubt bar is a vital part of justice dispensation system. It is the bar which effectively puts across the case of the litigant before the court. Role of the bar is certainly most crucial to ensure a complete right to be heard to the litigant. The counsel appearing in any litigation not only assists the court to arrive at just and fair decision of the dispute but also enables the litigants to effectively exercise their right to be heard. To that extent, there can be no dispute across the board. But at the same time, keeping in mind the pious status of bar in the justice dispensation system, a counsel is expected not to mislead the court in order to obtain favourable orders taking advantage of overflowing dockets and heavy boards. Merely with the address “my lord” or “lordship” or “with greatest respect” or “bow down”, it cannot be said that the counsel addressing the court has been fair to his duty. What transpired during the hearing on 04.03.2025 has been narrated in that order.
7. So far as narration of order dated 04.03.2025 is concerned, I fail to find any error in the recording of those proceedings.
8. However, in the present review application, the appellant has also again sought interim protection against the execution proceedings. As observed in details in order dated 04.03.2025, I did not find it a fit case to grant interim protection without hearing the other side and it is for that reason, notice was issued.
9. Since it is disclosed in the review application that execution proceedings are listed on 20.03.2025 and notice of the appeal has already



been directed returnable on 05.08.2025, in order to ensure that the litigant does not suffer on account of circumstances narrated in order dated 04.03.2025, despite heavy board of this court, the stay application be listed on 18.03.2025, for which date *dasti* notice be issued to the respondents on steps to be taken by the appellant during the course of the day.

10. Accordingly, relist on 18.03.2025. It is directed that on the next date, this matter shall be listed in first five matters of the Advance List.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

MARCH 6, 2025/ry

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)