



WEB COPY



CMP.No.27743 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 09.12.2024

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.K.R.SHRIRAM, CHIEF JUSTICE

AND

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY

CMP. 27743 of 2024

in

OSA(CAD) SR. 154932 of 2024

SHOBASHALINI CHOKKALINGAM

D/O. T.CHOCKKALINGAM, OLD DOOR NO.3, NEW DOOR NO.5, GANESH STREET, GOPALAPURAM, CHENNAI-600 086, REP BY HER POWER AGENTK.SURESH, S/O. C.K.PRABHAKARAN, RESIDING AT 6TH BLOCK, DOOR NO.815, 2ND FLOOR, MUGGAPPAIR WEST, CHENNAI-600 037
APPELLANT(S)

Vs

S. RAMESH

S/O. K.SUNDRESAN ANUVIGNESH APARTMENTS, NO.46/1, NEW NO.8/1, NAYAKKMAR ST., WEST MAMBALAM, CHENNAI 33 AND 5
OTHERS

RESPONDENT(S)

For Appellant(s): MR.A. RAJAGURU

**For Respondent(s): MRS.R.ANITHA SPECIAL GOVERNMENT PLEADER
(C.S) FOR R2**

ORDER

(Order of the Court was made by the Hon'ble Chief Justice)



CMP.No.27743 of 2024

WEB COPY

The application is to condone a delay of 850 days in filing the appeal. Except making a bald averment that the case was handled by another advocate who had not given any detail about the dismissal and the delay is neither willful nor wanton, there is no explanation whatsoever.

2. It is settled law that when a party pleads sufficient cause for not filing the appeal earlier, the sufficient cause must establish that because of some event or circumstance arising before the limitation expired, it was not possible to file the appeal within time. No explanation whatsoever is even attempted to be given in the affidavit. Even the present counsel has not thought it fit to advice the client to give explanation for the delay.

Application is dismissed.

(K.R.SHRIRAM, CJ.)

(SENTHILKUMAR RAMAMOORTHY, J.)

09.12.2024

SRA

Page 2 of 2