

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

CRR No. 1415 of 2013 (O&M)

DATE OF DECISION :- November 01, 2017

Sonu

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAN

Present:- None for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

There is no representation on behalf of the petitioner. Similar was the position on last date of hearing.

This petition has been filed belatedly by 54 days. Though an application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of delay has been filed but no justifiable reason has been mentioned for condonation of delay. Therefore, on the ground of delay alone, the petition is liable to be dismissed. However, on merits also the petition is not sustainable. I have gone through the judgments passed by the Courts below which I find to be well reasoned and having correct interpretation of law. There is no illegality or infirmity therein much less apparent on the face of the same. The judgments can certainly be not labeled as perverse. Therefore, no ground is

there to exercise the revisional jurisdiction. Finding no merit therein, the petition stands dismissed.

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

November 01, 2017
p.singh

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No