

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Civil Writ Petition No.16678 of 2015

Date of decision: 13.8.2015

Saroj Kumari

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent

CORAM: MR.JUSTICE G.S.SANDHAWALIA

Present: Mr. Gurnam Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

G.S.SANDHAWALIA, J, (Oral)

Relief sought is for consideration for appointment to the post of ANM(Multipurpose Health Worker Female) in pursuance of an advertisement issued in the year 1995.

Counsel for the petitioner submits that representation dated 19.9.2014 has been made and that the petitioner was not having the required documents when she was interviewed.

A perusal of the said representation would go on to show that the interview was held on 21.9.1996 and the alleged deficiency was made good on 26.9.1996. After a period of almost two decades, the petitioner has approached this Court. In such circumstances, keeping in view the settled principle that law protects the ones who are vigilant and do not sleep over their rights and lets them crystalize, this Court is disinclined to entertain the writ petition. The Hon'ble Apex Court in **Pundlik Jalam Patil (D) by LRs. vs. Exe. Eng. Jalgaon Medium Project and another, 2009**

(1) PLR 128 has observed as under:-

“14.....The applicant having set the machinery in motion cannot abandon it to resume it after number of years because the authority with whom it had entered into correspondence did not heed to its request to file appeals. The question is : Can the respondent/applicant in this case

take advantage of its negligence, after lapse of number of years, of the decision of Government? It knew the exact grounds on which appeals could have been preferred. The law will presume that it knew of its right to file appeal against the award. Everybody is presumed to know law. It was its duty to prefer appeals before the court for consideration which it did not. There is no explanation forthcoming in this regard. The evidence on record suggest neglect of its own right for long time in preferring appeals. The court cannot enquire into belated and stale claims on the ground of equity. Delay defeats equity. The court helps those who are vigilant and 'do not slumber over their rights.'

xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx

18. Shri Mohta, learned senior counsel relying on the decision of this court in [N. Balakrishnan vs. M. Krishnamurthy](#) [(1998) 7 SCC 123] submitted that length of delay is no matter, acceptability of explanation is the only criterion. It was submitted that if the explanation offered does not smack of mala fides or it is not put forth as part of dilatory tactics the court must show utmost consideration to the suitor. The very said decision upon which reliance has been placed holds that the law of limitation fixes a life span for every legal remedy for the redress of the legal injury suffered. Unending period for launching the remedy may lead to unending uncertainty and consequential anarchy. The law of Limitation is thus founded on public policy. The decision does not lay down that a lethargic litigant can leisurely choose his own time in preferring appeal or application as the case may be. On the other hand, in the said judgment it is said that court should not forget the opposite party altogether. It is observed:

It is enshrined in the maxim interest reipublicae up sit finis litium (it is for the general welfare that a period be put to litigation). Rules of limitation are not meant to destroy the rights of the parties. They are meant to see that parties do not resort to dilatory tactics but seek their remedy promptly. The idea is that every legal remedy must be kept alive for a legislatively fixed period of time."

The process of the appointment and selection in pursuance of an advertisement cannot be kept open for time immemorial.

In view of above, this Court is of the opinion that there is no merit in the present writ petition and the same is dismissed accordingly.

August 13, 2015
Pka

(G.S.SANDHAWALIA)
Judge