

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

**LPA No. 1461 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 05.10.2018**

Market Committee, Shahabad (M) District Kurukshetra

... Appellant

Versus

**Permanent Lok Adalat, Public Utility Services, Karnal, Camp Court at
Kurukshetra and others**

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KRISHNA MURARI,
CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN PALLI, JUDGE**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Moudgil, Advocate
for the applicant-appellant.

KRISHNA MURARI, CHIEF JUSTICE (Oral)

This intra-court appeal, under Clause X of the Letters Patent, has been filed by the petitioner-appellant, challenging the judgment and order dated 11.10.2017, passed by the learned Single Judge, dismissing the writ petition.

The writ petition was filed challenging the award passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat, allowing the claim for grant of compensation and awarding a sum of ₹2 lakhs in favour of family members of the deceased, to be borne equally by the petitioner-appellant and the State of Haryana.

Office has reported delay and laches of 283 days in filing the appeal. The ground set out in the application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, seeking condonation of delay, has been found to be as

LPA No. 1461 of 2018 (O&M)

-2-

usual as we have found in most of the delayed appeals filed on behalf of the State or its instrumentality that the delay has occurred on account of movement of file from one desk to another and one office to another, seeking opinion and sanction. Actually, no justification has been given as to why it took so much time in one office and why it could not be forwarded to the other office within a reasonable time.

In the absence of any plausible explanation, we are not inclined to condone the inordinate delay of 283 days in filing this appeal. Even otherwise on merits, we do not find any error reflecting from the impugned judgment and order passed by the learned Single Judge, which may require our interference.

In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act stands dismissed. As a result, the appeal stands dismissed as barred by limitation.

(KRISHNA MURARI)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(ARUN PALLI)
JUDGE

October 05, 2018
AK Sharma

Whether speaking / reasoned:	YES
Whether Reportable:	NO