

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

CWP No. 14005 of 2016

Date of decision: 22.7.2016

Vijay Singh

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana & ors.

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV NARAIN RAINA

Present: Mr. Bishan Dass Rana, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

1. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
2. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

RAJIV NARAIN RAINA, J.(Oral)

This petition suffers from delay and laches as the cause of action accrued in 2001 when the alleged junior was promoted. Argument raised to explain sufficient cause is that repeated representations have been made and therefore, the claim is alive. It is well settled that repeated representations do not create a fresh cause of action. An order will not be passed leading to an impression in the mind of the competent administrative authority that delay in approaching court stands condoned or cause of action stands revived, if a direction is issued by the writ court to decide representation/s within a time bound period, when claim is time barred. The request for such an order as fervently made by the learned counsel for the petitioner is turned down.

Dismissed.

**(RAJIV NARAIN RAINA)
JUDGE**

22.7.2016
monika