

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**REVP No. 109 of 2015**

- 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)

---- Petitioner**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, Collocotrate Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
4. Jila Panchayat Bilaspur Through The Chief Executive Officer, Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)
5. Janpad Panchayat Patharia Through Chief Executive Officer, Pathariya, District Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Shri NK Malaviya, Advocate
For Respondents-State	:	Shri Shashank Thakur, GA for the State

Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra**Order On Board****08/02/2016**

1. This review petition has been preferred against the order passed by the Learned Single Judge on 12-1-2011 in WPS No.119/2011.
2. The review petition is barred by 1668 days. In her application for condonation of delay in filing the review application, the petitioner would state that after the judgment rendered by the Single Bench, the petitioner

and her father made efforts to collect documents under the Right to Information Act, 2005 in September, 2013 and thereafter visited from one office to another and tried to contact several lawyers, however, she could not get proper advise within time, therefore, the delay in filing the review petition has occurred.

3. A careful reading of the application would demonstrate that the petitioner has not been able to explain day to day delay in filing the review application. Moreover, the delay is not of few days or months but it is to the extent of 1668 days i.e. nearly five years. Petitioner has not elaborated in the application as to which lawyer she visited and what suggestions/advise was given to her. However, liberal approach the Court may take in such matters, the present would not fall in the category where the delay should be condoned. The omnibus statement that the petitioner visited several advocates would not serve the purpose nor would it be an explanation to bring the case within the term *bona fide* explanation for the delay.
4. No case for condonation of such enormous delay is made out. Accordingly, I.A. No.1, an application for condonation of delay is dismissed; as a necessary consequence, the review petition is also dismissed.

Sd/-

Judge
Prashant Kumar Mishra

ashu