

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(1) CM-1295-CWP-2020
IN RA-CW-32-2020
IN CWP-7369-2017
Date of decision:21.04.2023

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS ...Respondents

(2) CM-12350-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-161-2022
IN CM-15010-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7365-2017

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS ...Respondents

(3) CM-12732-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-172-2022
IN CM-15015-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7360-2017

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS ...Respondents

(4) CM-12736-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-175-2022
IN CM-15011-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7354-2017

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL ...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS ...Respondents

(5) CM-12748-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-179-2022
IN CM-15012-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7355-2017

CM-1295-CWP-2020 IN RA-CW-32-2020
IN CWP-7369-2017 & other connected cases
GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL

2023:PHHC:056553-DB
-2-

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

(6)

CM-12738-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-177-2022
IN CM-15013-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7367-2017

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

(7)

CM-12737-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-176-2022
IN CM-14986-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7371-2017

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

(8)

CM-12735-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-174-2022
IN CM-15004-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7358-2017

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

(9)

CM-12739-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-178-2022
IN CM-14987-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7362-2017

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CM-1295-CWP-2020 IN RA-CW-32-2020
IN CWP-7369-2017 & other connected cases
(10)

2023:PHHC:056553-DB
-3-

CM-12733-CWP-2022
IN RA-CW-173-2022
IN CM-15014-CWP-2018
IN CWP-7357-2017

GRAM PANCHAYAT OF VILLAGE DHANITHAL

...Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESHWAR THAKUR
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU**

Present: Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate
for the applicants/petitioners (in all cases)

Ms. Monika Jalota, Sr. DAG, Punjab

Mr. Satwant Singh Rangi, Advocate
for respondent No.3 (in CWP Nos.7354, 7355, 7357, 7358, 7360,
7362, 7369, 7371 of 2017)

SURESHWAR THAKUR, J. (ORAL)

1. Since all the applications arise from a common order, therefore, all the writ petitions are amenable to be decided through a common verdict.

2. This Court, on 04.09.2018, had for non prosecution dismissed the writ petitions (supra). However, for recalling of the said order or for restoring the writ petitions (supra), to their respective original number(s), an application was made on 25.09.2018 by the petitioners. On consideration of the averments made in the said applications, this Court on 08.02.2019, did not find any valid reason for making any interference with the order (supra), as became drawn on 04.09.2018, whereby the writ petition (supra) were dismissed for non prosecution.

2. Be that as it may, subsequently the applicants preferred apposite CMs within the writ petition(s) (supra), claiming therein the relief of a review being made of the order drawn by this Court, on 08.02.2019. However, this Court

on 06.12.2019, did not deem it fit, and, appropriate to make a review of the order as became drawn on 08.02.2019, whereby this Court did not deem it just, and, appropriate to allow the application for the re-calling of the order made on 04.09.2018, whereby this Court became constrained to dismiss the petitions (supra) but for non prosecution or for default.

3. However, subsequently applications have been filed in the writ petitions, claiming therein, relief, for a fresh review being made of the order made on 08.02.2019 by this Court, on the apposite applications (supra), whereby this Court was led to dismiss the said review applications, thus thereby it became constrained to uphold the order made by this Court, on 04.09.2018.

4. Subsequent thereto, the instant review application(s) became preferred. The said review applications are visibly barred by a period of about 285 days. The said gross period of delay remains not validly unexplained. The very fact, that the instant review application(s) is visibly barred with a vice of an unexplained delay but occurring since a dismissal order being made on 06.12.2019, upon, the earlier review applications, thus irrespective of the fact that they are impermissible second review application(s), but yet the graphic ingraining therein of the above vice, is therefore, but an exemplification of the recurring unvindicable lethargy, besides negligence of the applicants, to within the time as ordained by law but re-access this Court.

5. Therefore, after refusing to condone, the above hence not cogently well explicated rather period of gross delay, the extant review application(s), as, filed in the writ petitions, (supra) also become dismissed as such.

6. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

(SURESHWAR THAKUR)
JUDGE

21.04.2023

Ithlesh

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No