

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

**CWP No. 16039 of 2018
DECIDED ON: JULY 05, 2018**

MANGAT RAM

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

UTTAR HARYANA BIJLI VITRAN NIGAM LTD & ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Jagbir Malik, Advocate
 for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J (ORAL)

By virtue of instant petition preferred under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought for the issuance of writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to count his work charge served w.e.f. 06.09.1968 to 26.10.1971 as well as ad hoc service w.e.f. 27.10.1971 to 04.02.1977 followed by regular service for the purpose of grant of retiral benefits with further direction to revise his pension after granting him the benefit of work charge service and ad hoc service and also to release the arrears thereof, along-with interest @12 % per annum

2.

Undisputably, petitioner stood retired on attaining the age of

superannuation on 30.11.2006. Thereafter, till date petitioner did not opt to approach either concerned authorities or Court but except only on 02.07.2018 by way of filing of instant petition. Thus, there is a considerable delay on the part of the petitioner in approaching the Court. There is no explanation what to talk of any plausible explanation for not taking up the matter and filing of such petition earlier. Thus, petitioner is guilty of long delay and laches which is suggestive of the fact that he is deemed to have acquiesced or waived off his claim or right. Such a relief cannot be claimed ignoring the long and unexplained delay simply because, it is a continuing cause.

3. In an identical matter captioned as **Jagdish Lal v. State of Haryana, 1998(1) SCT 26 (SC) : (1997) 6 SCC 538**, the Hon'ble Apex Court observed that if a person chose to sit over the matter and woke up after the decision of Court, then such person cannot stand to benefit.

4. It is also equally settled that the law of limitation has legally to be construed especially in the circumstances that a right is accrued to the party opposite on account of delay which is attributed to the other party and said right cannot be scuttled down by taking a lenient view. Otherwise also, a party who approaches the Court is under a bounden duty to explain the delay in approaching the Court for a particular relief or to lay challenge to a specific order to which he/she aggrieved. To buttress this observation, we can have the reference made by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case **Brijesh Kumar and others vs. State of Haryana and others, 2014 (11) SCC 351 and Esha Bhattacharjee vs. Raghunathpur Nafar Academy & others, 2013(4) RCR (Civil) 785**.

5.

Adverting to the facts of the case in hand, cause of action, if

any, would have accrued to the petitioner on the date of his retirement i.e. 30.11.2006, whereas he approached this Court in the month of July 2018, i.e. approximately after more than a decade, that too, without any explanation.

6. Thus, in view of the facts and circumstances narrated above and the legal proposition, it can be safely observed that instant petition suffers from delay and laches especially in the circumstances that the petitioner slept over the matter for a considerable number of years from the date of accrual of cause of action without any reasonable cause

7. In the light of what has been discussed above and in view of the authoritative pronouncements, referred to above, instant petition being devoid of merits is dismissed.

8. No order as to costs.

JULY 05, 2018
sham

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>