

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Appeal No. 201 of 2016**

Anita Kumari D/o Bhagchand Aged About 25 Years R/o Village
Nayapara [dhaiwai] Post : Borsi, Thana & Tahsil Baloda Bazar, District
Raipur [now] Baloda Bazar Bhatapara (Chhattisgarh)

---- Appellant**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Department Of Panchayat & Rural Development, D.K.S. Bhawan Mantralaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) Now It Is Mahanadi Bhawan Naya Raipur Thana And District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
2. The Director, Department Of Panchayat, Tahsil Raipur Thana & District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Collector Bilaspur The Collectorate Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
4. Jila Panchayat Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh) Through The Executive Officer Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
5. Janpad Panchayat Patharia, Through Chief Executive Officer Pathariya District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

-----Respondents

For Appellant:	Shri Neelkanth Malviya, Advocate.
For Respondents/State:	Shri YS. Thakur, Deputy Advocate General.

Hon'ble The Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy****Order on Board****Per Deepak Gupta, Chief Justice****13/07/2016**

1. This Writ Petition is directed against the order dated 8.2.2016 passed by the Learned Single Judge in Review Petition No.109/2015 whereby he refused to review the earlier order dated 12.1.2011.

2. The only ground for dismissing the Review Petition was that there was delay of 1668 days i.e. nearly 5 years and the Petitioner therein has not

elaborately stated as to why she could not file the Review Petition within 5 years.

3. We have perused the Review Petition as well as the application for condonation of delay. Neither in the Review Petition nor in the application for condonation of delay are there any clearcut averments as to why the delay should be condoned.

4. The Petitioner has taken 3 pleas, firstly that she kept on going from one Lawyer to another seeking legal advice but as observed by the Learned Single Judge, the names of any Lawyer have not been mentioned. Secondly, that she came to first know about this information on 20.11.2013. However, this fact is not correct. True it is that the father of the Petitioner obtained some information under the Right to Information Act on 11.9.2015. But, before he could have applied for the same under the Right to Information Act, he must have come to know about the information on the basis of which he had applied for the same under the said Act. The application is totally silent with regard to the knowledge of the date/time when they came to know about the said fact before applying under the Right to Information Act. The third ground is that even now the information available is not complete. This allegation is totally vague.

5. A person who approaches the Court must approach the Court within a reasonable period. This Court cannot come to the aid of indolent litigants who sleep over their rights. This is not a delay of a month or few months but a delay of almost 5 years. The explanation given is also not worth credence and the Learned Single Judge has rightly rejected the same.

6. In view of above, the Writ Appeal being devoid of merits, is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
(Deepak Gupta)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE

Priya