

Pdp

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 231 OF 2024

Jagannath Tikaram Mahavar

.. Petitioner

Versus

Oil and Natural Gas Corporation
Limited, through Head Regional
Office Western Offshore Unit

.. Respondent

Mr. Santosh S. Gavade for petitioner.

Mr. Nishin Shrikhande i/by Vidhi Parnters for respondent.

**CORAM: DEVENDRA KUMAR UPADHYAYA, CJ. &
ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.**

DATE: 24th JANUARY, 2024

P.C.:

- 1.** Heard Mr. Gavade, learned counsel representing the petitioner and Mr. Shrikhande, learned counsel representing the respondent – Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.
- 2.** The claim put-forth in the writ petition is in respect of grant of annual increment to the petitioner and, accordingly, a prayer has been made to issue an appropriate direction to the respondent to grant the petitioner one annual increment notionally which, according to the petitioner, became due on 1st January, 2012.
- 3.** The petitioner was employed with the respondent – Corporation and retired on 31st December, 2011 from the post of Executive Director. His claim is based on Clause 11 of Pay

and Allowances Regulations, 1972, according to which an increment shall ordinarily be drawn as a matter of course unless it is withheld and shall be granted on the first of January each year. Said provisions further provide that where during a calendar year the total of the period which does not count for increment exceeds 180 days, the employee shall earn his increment only on the 1st January of the year thereafter.

4. Admittedly, the petitioner retired on 31st December, 2011 and according to Clause 11 of the aforesaid Regulations, 1972, the annual increment, if any, became due to him on 1st January, 2012. However, the petitioner has filed this writ petition after a lapse of about 12 years without explaining the delay.

5. It is true that for invoking the writ jurisdiction of this Court, the law does not prescribe any limitation, however, anyone approaching the Court has to explain inordinate delay and laches.

6. There is nothing on record of the writ petition which explains such a long and inordinate delay and laches on the part of the petitioner in invoking the writ jurisdiction of this Court.

7. The writ petition is, thus, dismissed on the ground of unexplained delay and laches.

(ARIF S. DOCTOR, J.)

(CHIEF JUSTICE)