



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 01.03.2021

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE J.NISHA BANU

C.M.P(MD)No.5564 of 2019

in

C.M.A(MD).SR.No.22885 of 2019

The Regional Director,
Employees' State Insurance Corporation,
Chennai.

... Petitioner/Appellant

Vs.

M/s.VKN Engineering Works,
Rep. through its Administrative Partner,
L.Kannappan,
D5, Developed Estate,
Thuvakudi,
Trichirappalli-625 005.

....Respondent/Respondent

Prayer in C.M.P(MD).No.5564 of 2019: This petition is filed under Section 82(3) of ESI Act,1948 to condone the delay of 1044 days in filing the above appeal, against the decree and judgment passed by Employees' State Insurance Court (cum) Labour Court, Tiruchirappalli in E.S.I.O.P.No.2 of 2006 dated 09.06.2016.

Prayer in C.M.A(MD).SR.No.22885 of 2019: This Civil Miscellaneous Appeal is filed under Section 82(2) of ESI Act, 1948, against the Judgment and Decree dated 09.06.2016 passed by the ESI Court cum Labour Court, Tiruchirappalli in ESI OP.No.2 of 2006, as illegal and against the specific provisions of law and allow the above appeal.

For Petitioner : Mr.I.Pinay gash

ORDER

This Civil Miscellaneous Petition has been filed to condone the delay of 1044 days in filing the above appeal.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner-ESI Corporation would submit that due to oversight of the lower Court counsel, there was a delay in applying certified copy of the order dated 09.06.2016, and it was applied only on 18.08.2016. Thereafter, the higher officials of the petitioner's Corporation had decided to file appeal after conducting review meeting and they handed over the case to the present counsel only on 08.05.2019. Hence, the delay is neither



wilful nor wanton and would pray to condone the delay of 1044 days in filing the above appeal.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the parties and also perused the materials available on record.

WEB COPY

4. In **State of Bihar vs. Deo Kumar Singh (SLP (Civil) No.13348/2019 dated 05.05.2019**, the appeal was filed with the delay of 728 days stating that the delay occurred in obtaining all the sanctions from the respective departments and also in receiving the affidavit and vakalathnama from the concerned department. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the said case, has held that a clear signal has to sent to the Government Authorities that they cannot approach the Court as and when they please on account of gross incompetence of their officers and that too without taking any action against the concerned officers. Ultimately, in the said case, the Apex Court while declining to condone the delay of 728 days in filing the appeal, imposed the cost of Rs.20,000/- to be recovered from the officers responsible for that delay and be deposited to the Mediation Centre of the Supreme Court within four weeks.

5. In yet another case in **Esha Bhattacharjee v. Managing Committee of Raghunathpur Nafar Academy & others, [2013 (5) CTC 547 (SC) : 2013 (5) LW 20]**, it was observed by the Supreme Court that there should be a liberal, pragmatic, justice oriented, non-pedantic approach while dealing with an Application for condonation of delay. The principles elucidated at paras 15 and 16 of the said judgment, are usefully extracted as follows:

"15. From the aforesaid authorities the principles that can broadly be culled out are:

(i) There should be a liberal, pragmatic, justice-oriented, non-pedantic approach while dealing with an application for condonation of delay, for the Courts are not supposed to legalise injustice but are obliged to remove injustice.

(ii) The terms sufficient cause should be understood in their proper spirit, philosophy and purpose regard being had to the fact that these terms are basically elastic and are to be applied in proper perspective to the obtaining fact-situation.

(iii) Substantial justice being paramount and pivotal the technical considerations should not be given undue and uncalled for emphasis.

(iv) No presumption can be attached to deliberate causation of delay but, gross negligence on the part of the Counsel or litigant is to be taken note of.



(v) Lack of bona fides imputable to a party seeking condonation of delay is a significant and relevant fact.

(vi) It is to be kept in mind that adherence to strict proof should not affect public justice and cause public mischief because the Courts are required to be vigilant so that in the ultimate eventuate there is no real failure of justice.

(vii) The concept of liberal approach has to en capsule the conception of reasonableness and it cannot be allowed a totally unfettered free play.

(viii) There is a distinction between inordinate delay and a delay of short duration or few days, for to the former doctrine of prejudice is attracted whereas to the latter it may not be attracted. That apart, the first one warrants strict approach whereas the second calls for a liberal delineation.

(ix) The conduct, behaviour and attitude of a party relating to its inaction or negligence are relevant factors to be taken into consideration. It is so as the fundamental principle is that the Courts are required to weigh the scale of balance of justice in respect of both parties and the said principle cannot be given a total go by in the name of liberal approach.

(x) If the explanation offered is concocted or the grounds urged in the application are fanciful, the Courts should be vigilant not to expose the other side unnecessarily to face such a litigation.

(xi) It is to be borne in mind that no one gets away with fraud, misrepresentation or interpolation by taking recourse to the technicalities of law of limitation.

(xii) The entire gamut of facts are to be carefully scrutinized and the approach should be based on the paradigm of judicial discretion which is founded on objective reasoning and not on individual perception.

(xiii) The State or a public body or an entity representing a collective cause should be given some acceptable latitude.

16. To the aforesaid principles we may add some more guidelines taking note of the present day scenario. They are:



(a) An Application for condonation of delay should be drafted with careful concern and not in a half hazard manner harbouring the notion that the Courts are required to condone delay on the bedrock of the principle that adjudication of a lis on merits is seminal to justice dispensation system.

(b) An application for condonation of delay should not be dealt with in a routine manner on the base of individual philosophy which is basically subjective.

(c) Though no precise formula can be laid down regard being had to the concept of judicial discretion, yet a conscious effort for achieving consistency and collegiality of the adjudicatory system should be made as that is the ultimate institutional motto.

(d) The increasing tendency to perceive delay as a non-serious matter and, hence, lackadaisical propensity can be exhibited in a non-challan manner requires to be curbed, of course, within legal parameters."

6. Now coming to the present facts and circumstances of the case, though the learned counsel for the petitioner/ESI Corporation has narrated few administrative reasons for the delay of 1044 days in filing the above appeal, however, the delay is not minimal and it is a very long delay. In view of the above judgments of the Apex Court, such kind of reasons cannot be termed as sufficient reasons to condone the delay. In my considered opinion, it is very unfortunate that no convincing and acceptable reasons have been adduced by the petitioner/ESI Corporation for condoning the delay and therefore, this Court is not inclined to condone the delay of 1044 days in filing the appeal.

7. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed. In view of the order passed in C.M.P(MD)No.5564 of 2019, the connected C.M.A.(MD) SR.No.22885 of 2019 is rejected at the SR stage itself. No costs.

Sd/-


Assistant Registrar (A.S.)

// True Copy //

/ /2021

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

PKN



Note: In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To

The Presiding Officer,
ESI Court cum Labour Court,
Tiruchirappalli.

+1 CC to Mr.I.PINAY GASH, Advocate (SR-8243[F] dated 02/03/2021)

Order made in
C.M.P(MD)No.5564 of 2019 in
C.M.A(MD) .SR.No.22885 of 2019
01.03.2021

DKS (CO)
SRS (09/03/2021) 5P : 3C