



**CRM-46889-2024 in/and
CRR(F)-1491-2024 (O&M)**

119

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-46889-2024 in/and
CRR(F)-1491-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.12.2024**

GURDAS SINGH

.. Applicant/Petitioner**Vs.**

KIRANJEET KAUR

..Respondent**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Sahil Khunger, Advocate for applicant-petitioner.

...

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the applicant-husband seeking condonation of delay of 246 days in filing the accompanying revision petition. The main revision petition has been filed impugning the judgment dated 21.12.2023 passed by learned Addl. Principal Judge (Family Court), Ludhiana whereby the petition under Section 125 of Cr.P.C. for grant of maintenance allowance was partly allowed and the petitioner-husband (herein) was directed to pay Rs.3,000/- per month to respondent-wife as maintenance allowance from the date of filing of the said petition before the Family Court.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant-petitioner, while seeking grant of prayer for condonation of delay of 246 days, has argued that the delay has occurred as the applicant-petitioner was informed by the learned counsel representing him before the trial Court in the month of May



**CRM-46889-2024 in/and
CRR(F)-1491-2024 (O&M)**

that the judgment dated 21.12.2023 had been passed against him and the applicant-petitioner was repeatedly asking for the certified copy of the said order so that the same could be challenged before this Court. Learned counsel for applicant-petitioner has iterated that learned counsel before the trial Court had handed over the certified copy of the impugned order as well as other documents to the applicant-petitioner in the last week of October, 2024 and thereafter, the applicant-petitioner immediately engaged the counsel before this Court and filed the accompanied revision petition. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner has further argued that the circumstances of the case indicate that the delay in filing the revision petition is neither intentional nor deliberate hence delay deserves to be condoned.

3. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner and have perused the paper-book.

4. It would be apposite to refer herein to a judgment of this Court passed in **CRR(F)-1844-2023** titled as '**Deepak vs. Noori and another**' decided on 29.02.2024; relevant whereof reads as under:-

"8. As a sequel to above-said discussion, the following principles of law emerge:

A liberal approach, undoubtedly, ought to be accorded to a plea for condonation of delay made under Section 5 of The Limitation Act, 1969 so as to further the cause of substantial justice. The concept of substantial justice essentially includes in itself the desirability of adjudication of a claim of the litigant on merits thereof rather than rejection of the same, at the threshold, on account of being barred by limitation. However, adoption of such liberal approach cannot be stretched to mean that a prayer (for condonation of delay) ought to be granted sans reasonable explanation therefor. An applicant (seeking condonation of delay) has to bring forward cogent, credible and lucid reason(s) to substantiate such a plea. In case such reason(s) is not scrutable, a Court would well be within its discretion to decline such plea (for condonation of delay). In other words, inexplicable delay ought not to be condoned.

II.A Court ought to grant an application seeking condonation of delay when no negligence, inaction or want of bona fide is imputable to



**CRM-46889-2024 in/and
CRR(F)-1491-2024 (O&M)**

such applicant and/or such delay has occurred on account of circumstances beyond reasonable control of such applicant.

III. It is not the length of delay (sought to be condoned) but explanation thereof which is relevant for consideration by a Court.

IV. Law of limitation does not require an applicant (seeking condonation of delay) to furnish an exhaustive explanation on 'day to-day basis' for such delay. A Court while dealing with a plea for condonation of delay need not undertake such a pedantic approach.

V. In appropriate cases, a Court may consider imposing costs while granting an application for condonation of delay. However, the quantification of costs so imposed, must reflect the same being commensurate to the lis in issue as also attending circumstances therein.

VI. The factum; of non-applicant(s) or even strangers having altered their position(s) relying upon the applicant not having filed an appeal/revision etc. within stipulated time and resultant effects thereof; will indubitably be a pertinent factor for consideration of a plea for condonation of delay.

VII. A plea for condonation of delay by the State as also its instrumentalities has to be accorded a more liberal approach since the machinery involved in their working is impersonal in nature & hidden factors working therein cannot be given a complete amiss.

VIII. The discretion of a Court, while considering a plea for condonation of delay, will be exercised in view of peculiar facts/circumstances of an individual case. It is neither prudent nor feasible to fix any exhaustive guidelines for exercising such judicial discretion. On the contrary, it would be perilous to lay down such general criteria for governing such discretion. Needless to emphasize that exercise of such judicial discretion/power ought to be within the four corners of well settled principles of justice, good conscience and fair play."

5. More recently, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as

'State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Ramkumar Choudhary', Neutral Citation:

2024 INSC 932, has observed as under:

"The legal position is that where a case has been presented in the Court beyond limitation, the petitioner has to explain the Court as to what was the "sufficient cause" which means an adequate and enough reason which prevented him to approach the Court within limitation. In Majji Sannemma v. Reddy Sridevi, it was held by this Court that even though limitation may harshly affect the rights of a party, it has to be applied with all its rigour when prescribed by statute. A reference was also made to the decision of this Court in Ajay Dabra v. Pyare Ram wherein, it was held as follows:

"13. This Court in the case of Basawaraj v. Special Land Acquisition Officer ((2013) 14 SCC 81] while rejecting an application for condonation of delay for lack of sufficient cause has concluded in Paragraph 15 as follows:

"15. The law on the issue can be summarised to the effect that where a case has been presented in the court beyond limitation, the applicant has to explain the court as to what was the "sufficient cause" which means an adequate and enough reason

CRM-46889-2024 in/and
CRR(F)-1491-2024 (O&M)

which prevented him to approach the court within limitation. In case a party is found to be negligent, or for want of bona fide on his part in the facts and circumstances of the case, or found to have not acted diligently or remained inactive, there cannot be a justified ground to condone the delay. No court could be justified in condoning such an inordinate delay by imposing any condition whatsoever. The application is to be decided only within the parameters laid down by this Court in regard to the condonation of delay. In case there was no sufficient cause to prevent a litigant to approach the court on time condoning the delay without any justification, putting any condition whatsoever, amounts to passing an order in violation of the statutory provisions and it tantamounts to showing utter disregard to the legislature.

14. Therefore, we are of the considered opinion that the High Court did not commit any mistake in dismissing the delay condonation application of the present appellant."

Thus, it is crystal clear that the discretion to condone the delay has to be exercised judiciously based on facts and circumstances of each case and that, the expression 'sufficient cause' cannot be liberally interpreted, if negligence, inaction or lack of bona fides is attributed to the party."

6. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as ***Pathapati Subba Reddy (Died) by L.Rs & Ors. vs. The Special Deputy Collector (LA), Neutral Citation: 2024 INSC 286***, has observed as under:

"26. On a harmonious consideration of the provisions of the law, as aforesaid, and the law laid down by this Court, it is evident that:
xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx xxx
vii) Merits of the case are not required to be considered in condoning the delay; and
(viii) Delay condonation application has to be decided on the parameters laid down for condoning the delay and condoning the delay for the reason that the conditions have been imposed, tantamounts to disregarding the statutory provision."

7. Condonation of delay of 246 days in filing the accompanying revision petition is sought for on the following relevant averments:

"2. That the petitioner was informed by his counsel in the month of May 2024 that the Ld. Additional Principal Judge (Family Court) Ludhiana vide order dated 21.12.2023 has awarded Rs. 3,000/- per month as interim maintenance to the respondent wife and the petitioner asked his



**CRM-46889-2024 in/and
CRR(F)-1491-2024 (O&M)**

counsel to apply for the copy of the order so that the same can be challenged before the appropriate court of law.

3. That the petitioner kept on enquiring from his counsel to provide him with the copy of the order whereby interim maintenance was granted to the respondent wife but the counsel kept on informing the petitioner that the certified copy of the order has so far not been prepared and the petitioner was handed over the certified copy of the impugned order along with other interim orders and documents of the case by his counsel in the last week of October 2024.

4. That the petitioner after obtaining the documents came to know that the certified copy of the order was delivered on 03.07.2024 and when the petitioner contacted his counsel in the Trial Court he was informed that the said order needs to be challenged before the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court and immediately thereafter the petitioner in the first week of the November 2024 approached his counsel in the Hon'ble High Court at Chandigarh from where he got to know that the limitation to prefer the revision petition had already elapsed.

5. That the applicant/petitioner approached the present counsel for filing the revision petition on 02.11.2024 and the present counsel intimated the petitioner that there is a delay in impugning the order dated 21.12.2023 passed by Ld. Additional Principal Judge (Family Court) Ludhiana and when the counsel for the petitioner enquired from the petitioner regarding the delay part in filing the revision petition the petitioner was revealed the above mentioned facts and that he had no knowledge regarding further challenging the impugned order before the Hon'ble High Court and that he was not properly guided by his counsel in the Trial Court, hence the petitioner was unable to approach this Hon'ble High Court by filing the present petition within the prescribed period of limitation, hence the present application.

6. That the delay in filing in present CRR is not intentional and deliberate but has occurred due to the facts and circumstances stated above.”



**CRM-46889-2024 in/and
CRR(F)-1491-2024 (O&M)**

8. A perusal of the above-said averments clearly show that no reasonable or plausible explanation has been furnished by the applicant husband (herein) to condone the delay of 246 days in filing the accompanying revision petition. This application, apart from being bereft of any specific details/particulars which may reflect *bona fide* on part of the applicant in pursuing his case, rather reflects a deliberate attempt on part of the applicant-husband to somehow delay the proceedings and avoid the payment of maintenance to the respondent-wife. The applicant-husband has failed to provide any concrete explanation or document to demonstrate his genuine efforts in pursuing the matter within the prescribed time limit. No cause much less sufficient cause, as required in law, has been shown to justify or condone the significant delay of 246 days in filing the accompanying revision petition. The delay is both inordinate and inexplicable. Merely attributing the delay to unforeseen circumstances, without any supporting details or evidence to substantiate these claims, does not meet the legal threshold for condonation. The applicant-husband has neither shown continuous interest in the case nor presented any exceptional or unavoidable circumstances that could explain such an extensive delay.

8.1 The explanation for the delay contained in the application seeking condonation of delay is wholly unsatisfactory and can hardly be said to be a reasonable, satisfactory or even a proper explanation for seeking condonation of delay. In the facts and circumstances of the case as narrated hereinabove, the application seeking condonation of delay of 246 days in filing the accompanying revision petition merits dismissal.

**CRM-46889-2024 in/and
CRR(F)-1491-2024 (O&M)**

Decision

9. The application (CRM-46889-2024) seeking condonation of delay of 246 days in filing the accompanying revision petition is dismissed. Since the application seeking condonation of delay has been dismissed, the main revision petition stands dismissed as well accordingly.
10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

20.12.2024
Jasmine Kaur

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No