

OD-28

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
ORIGINAL SIDE

APOT/388/2024
IA NO: GA/1/2024, GA/2/2024
SHRI DURGESH
VS
CHIEF SECURITY COMMISSIONER, RAILWAY PROTECTION FORCE & ORS.

BEFORE :

THE HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE T.S SIVAGNANAM
-A N D-
HON'BLE JUSTICE CHAITALI CHATTERJEE (DAS)
DATE : 19th June, 2025.

*Mr. Achin Kumar Majumder, Adv.
...for appellant
Ms. Aparna Banerjee Adv.
...for respondent.*

The Court : There is a delay of 642 days in preferring the appeal within the period of limitation.

The only reason given in the affidavit filed in support of the condone delay application in IA No: GA/1/2024 is that the advocates who originally appeared for the appellant/writ petitioner did not take effective steps. This can hardly be a reason to condone the delay, more so, when the delay is inordinate as it is 642 days.

Thus, we are not persuaded to exercise any discretion in favour of the appellant and accordingly, the condone delay application is dismissed and consequently, the appeal stands rejected.

The stay application, GA/2/2024, also stands dismissed.

(T.S. SIVAGNANAM, C.J.)

(CHAITALI CHATTERJEE (DAS), J.)