

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Civil Revision No.8392 of 2014 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.07.2015

M/s Akshay Shubham Stone Crusher and another ... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and others Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. KANNAN

Present: Mr. Arun Singal, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Gaurav Goel, AAG, Haryana.

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ? No.
2. To be referred to the reporters or not ?No.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?No.

K.Kannan, J. (Oral)

1. There is an application for condoning the delay of 510 days which was allowed by the lower court and directed the appeal to be registered. The contention of the petitioner is that there was no adequate reasons given for condoning the delay and would refer to the decision in **Postmaster General and others Versus Living Media India Limited and another-(2012)3 Supreme Court Cases 563.**

2. Condonation of delay is a matter of discretion and if the appellate court thought that the matter would require an adjudication

on merits and allowed for the delay to be condoned, I will find no reason for interference with the same. Intervention in revision ought to be confined only to orders which are illegal or without jurisdiction. I find no fallability on either count. Revision petition is dismissed.

(K.KANNAN)
JUDGE

07.07.2015
sanjeev