

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (L) No. 101 of 2020**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Water Resources Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Executive Engineer, Hasdeo Canal Water Management Division, Janjgir, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh
3. Sub Divisional Officer, Champa Branch Canal, Sub Division No. 1, Siwani, Champa, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners

Versus

- Tikaram Sahu S/o Late Bisahu Ram Sahu R/o Village And Post Sukharikala, Tahsil Kartala, District Korba, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners : Mr. Sudeep Verma, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****24.11.2020**

1. The challenge in the present writ petition is to the order dated 29.04.2017 passed by the Controlling Authority under the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 i.e. the Labour Officer, Janjgir, District Janjgir-Champa in Gratuity Case No. 13/P.G.A./2016.
2. At the outset, this Court is of the opinion that the writ petition would not be maintainable for more than one ground. Firstly, the writ petition is highly belated for the reason that the order under challenge is one

which was passed on 29.04.2017 and the present writ petition has been filed on 16.09.2020 i.e. after more than 3 ½ years time.

3. As regards filing of writ petition at a belated stage, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has time and again come down heavily for Courts not to entertain the petitions which have been filed at a belated stage or the petition which suffers delay and laches. The question of delay and laches came to be considered by the Supreme Court in case of "***State of Uttaranchal and Another v. Shiv Charan Singh Bhandari and Others***", reported in ***2013 (12) SCC 179*** in which the Court has declined to exercise extraordinary jurisdiction in case the petitioner invokes jurisdiction of Court with inordinate delay, and held as under :

"In *State of T.N. v. Seshachalam* [8], this Court, testing the equality clause on the bedrock of delay and laches pertaining to grant of service benefit, has ruled thus: -

...filing of representations alone would not save the period of limitation. Delay or laches is a relevant factor for a court of law to determine the question as to whether the claim made by an applicant deserves consideration. Delay and/or laches on the part of a government servant may deprive him of the benefit which had been given to others. Article 14 of the Constitution of India would not, in a situation of that nature, be attracted as it is well known that law leans in favour of those who are alert and vigilant."

4. Likewise, in the case of "***Uttaranchal Forest Development Corpn. And another v. Jabar Singh and others***" reported in ***(2007) 2 SCC 112***, it was observed as under:

"43. The termination order was made in the year 1995 and the writ petitions were admittedly filed in the year 2005 after a delay of 10 years. The High Court, in our opinion, was not justified in entertaining the writ petition on the ground that the

petition has been filed after a delay of 10 years and that the writ petitions should have been dismissed by the High Court on the ground of laches.”

5. Further, in the case of “***New Delhi Municipal Council v. Pan Singh and others***” reported in ***(2007) 9 SCC 278***, the Supreme Court reiterating the principles relating to interference in cases where the petitioner approached the Court with unexplained delay, held as under:

“16. There is another aspect of the matter which cannot be lost sight of. The respondents herein filed a writ petition after 17 years. They did not agitate their grievances for a long time. They, as noticed herein, did not claim parity with the 17 workmen at the earliest possible opportunity. They did not implead themselves as parties even in the reference made by the State before the Industrial Tribunal. It is not their case that after 1982, those employees who were employed or who were recruited after the cut-off date have been granted the said scale of pay. After such a long time, therefore, the writ petitions could not have been entertained even if they are similarly situated. It is trite that the discretionary jurisdiction may not be exercised in favour of those who approach the court after a long time. Delay and laches are relevant factors for exercise of equitable jurisdiction. (See *Govt. of W.B. v. Tarun K. Roy*, *U.P. Jal Nigam v. Jaswant Singh* and *Karnataka Power Corpn. Ltd. v. K. Thangappan*.)”

6. In the case of “***P. S. Sadasivaswamy v. State of Tamil Nadu***” reported in ***(1975) 1 SCC 152***, it has been held as under:-

“It is not that there is any period of limitation for the Courts to exercise their powers under Article 226 nor is it that there can never be a case where the Courts cannot interfere in a matter after the passage of a certain length of time. But it would be a sound and wise exercise of discretion for the Courts to refuse to exercise their extraordinary powers under Article 226 in the case of persons who do not approach it expeditiously for relief and who stand by and allow things to happen and then approach the Court to put forward stale claims and try to unsettle settled matters. The petitioner’s

petition should, therefore, have been dismissed in limine. Entertaining such petitions is a waste of time of the Court. It clogs the work of the Court and impedes the work of the Court in considering legitimate grievances as also its normal work. We consider that the High Court was right in dismissing the appellant's petition as well as the appeal."

7. Very recently in the matter of "***Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage Board and Others v. T.T. Murali Babu***" reported in **2014 (4) SCC 108**, the Supreme Court has clearly held that the delay may have impact on others' ripened rights and may unnecessarily drag others into litigation, and expressed their opinion as under-

"16. Thus, the doctrine of delay and laches should not be lightly brushed aside. A writ court is required to weigh the explanation offered and the acceptability of the same. The court should bear in mind that it is exercising an extraordinary and equitable jurisdiction. As a constitutional court it has a duty to protect the rights of the citizens but simultaneously it is to keep itself alive to the primary principle that when an aggrieved person, without adequate reason, approaches the court at his own leisure or pleasure, the Court would be under legal obligation to scrutinize whether the lis at a belated stage should be entertained or not. Be it noted, delay comes in the way of equity. In certain circumstances delay and laches may not be fatal but in most circumstances inordinate delay would only invite disaster for the litigant who knocks at the doors of the Court. Delay reflects inactivity and inaction on the part of a litigant—a litigant who has forgotten the basic norms, namely, "procrastination is the greatest thief of time" and second, law does not permit one to sleep and rise like a phoenix. Delay does bring in hazard and causes injury to the lis.

In the case at hand, though there has been four years' delay in approaching the court, yet the writ court chose not to address the same. It is the duty of the court to scrutinize whether such enormous delay is to be ignored without any justification. That apart, in the present case, such belated approach gains more significance as the respondent-employee being absolutely careless to his duty and nurturing a lackadaisical attitude to the

responsibility had remained unauthorisedly absent on the pretext of some kind of ill health. We repeat at the cost of repetition that remaining innocuously oblivious to such delay does not foster the cause of justice. On the contrary, it brings in injustice, for it is likely to affect others. Such delay may have impact on others' ripened rights and may unnecessarily drag others into litigation which in acceptable realm of probability, may have been treated to have attained finality. A court is not expected to give indulgence to such indolent persons – who compete with 'Kumbhakarna' or for that matter 'Rip Van Winkle'. In our considered opinion, such delay does not deserve any indulgence and on the said ground alone the writ court should have thrown the petition overboard at the very threshold."

8. The second ground on which the writ petition would not be maintainable is that the order under challenge is one which has been passed invoking the provisions of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972. Section 7 (7) of the said Act provides for an appeal before the Appellate Authority within the stipulated period as provided under the said Act. The petitioners herein have not availed the said remedy of appeal which was available to them nor was there any justifiable reason provided for not preferring an appeal before the Appellate Authority promptly and also not approaching this Court at that point of time invoking the powers of judicial review of this Court.
9. For both the grounds, this Court is of the opinion that the present writ petition would not be maintainable. The writ petition thus deserves to be and is accordingly dismissed.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge