

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

LAA No.36 of 2019

***The Zone Officer, Zone No.I,
R.R.C.S., Baghuabole, Talcher,
Dist.-Angul***

....

Appellant

Mr. Gajendra Nath Rout, ASC

-versus-

Surendra Kandia and others

....

***Respondents
None***

CORAM:

MR. JUSTICE S.K. MISHRA

ORDER

11.08.2022

Order No.

I.A. No.,111 of 2019

- 02.
1. This matter is taken up through hybrid mode.
 2. Though this I.A. has been filed under Section 149 of Civil Procedure Code for time to pay the Deficit Court Fee, but in the meantime, Deficit Court Fee has been paid on 02.12.2019.
 3. Deficit Court Fee paid late be accepted.
 4. Accordingly, the I.A. stands disposed of.

**(S.K. MISHRA)
JUDGE**

I.A. No.112 of 2019 & L.A.A. No.36 of 2019

- 03.
1. Heard.
 2. This Appeal has been preferred against the Judgment dated 23.04.2012, passed by the learned Civil Judge (Sr. Division),

Athamallik, in L.A. Case No.107 of 2011 on 30.07.2019. As per the office note, there is a delay of 2492 days in filing the present Appeal. Though this I.A. has been filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of delay, but the reasons indicated in the said I.A. are not convincing and it seems, the delay has not been properly explained.

3. The apex Court in the case of ***Office of the Chief Post Master General & Ors. Vrs. Living Media India Ltd. & Anr.*** reported in ***(2012) 3 SCC 563*** observed as under:

“12) It is not in dispute that the person(s) concerned were well aware or conversant with the issues involved including the prescribed period of limitation for taking up the matter by way of filing a special leave petition in this Court. They cannot claim that they have a separate period of limitation when the Department was possessed with competent persons familiar with court proceedings. In the absence of plausible and acceptable explanation, we are posing a question why the delay is to be condoned mechanically merely because the Government or a wing of the Government is a party before us.

Though we are conscious of the fact that in a matter of condonation of delay when there was no gross negligence or deliberate inaction or lack of bonafide, a liberal concession has to be adopted to advance substantial justice, we are of the view that in the facts and circumstances, the Department cannot take advantage of various earlier decisions. The claim on account of impersonal machinery and inherited bureaucratic methodology of making several notes cannot be accepted in view of the modern technologies being used and available. The law of limitation undoubtedly binds everybody including the Government.

13) In our view, it is the right time to inform all the government bodies, their agencies and instrumentalities that unless they have reasonable and acceptable explanation for the delay and there was bonafide effort, there is no need to accept the usual explanation that the file

was kept pending for several months/years due to considerable degree of procedural red tape in the process. The government departments are under a special obligation to ensure that they perform their duties with diligence and commitment. Condonation of delay is an exception and should not be used as an anticipated benefit for government departments. The law shelters everyone under the same light and should not be swirled for the benefit of a few. Considering the fact that there was no proper explanation offered by the Department for the delay except mentioning of various dates, according to us, the Department has miserably failed to give any acceptable and cogent reasons sufficient to condone such a huge delay. Accordingly, the appeals are liable to be dismissed on the ground of delay.”

4. Also, in view of the recent judgment/order of this Court in the case of *State of Odisha Vrs. Surama Manjari Das* (W.P.(C) No.15763 of 2021 dismissed on 16.07.2021), which has been passed relying on the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *The State of Madhya Pradesh Vrs. Bherulal*, reported in *2020 SCC Online* SC 849, this Court is not inclined to issue notice to the Respondents on the question of limitation in the present I.A.

5. Accordingly, the I.A. stands dismissed, so also the Appeal preferred under Section 54 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894.

(S.K. MISHRA)
JUDGE