



iam

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA**  
**MISC. CIVIL APPLICATION NO.71 OF 2024**  
**IN**  
**FIRST APPEAL NO. 2317 OF 2021(F)**

**DILIP VOICUNTA SINAI BOBO ALIAS**  
**DILIP VOICUNT BHOBE AND ANR ... APPLICANTS**

**Versus**

**VOICUNTA XABULI SINAI BOBO**  
**(SINCE DEC.) THR LRS**  
**AND 14 ORS. ... RESPONDENTS**

Mr. Atul Sadre, Advocate for the Applicant/Appellant.

Mr. R. G. Ramani, Senior Advocate with Mr. Vinayak  
Nevrekar, Advocate for Respondent Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9.

**CORAM:- SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.**

**DATED:- 28<sup>th</sup> November, 2025**

P.C.

1. This is an application filed by the Appellant/Applicant seeking condonation of delay in preferring the First Appeal against the Judgment and Order dated 9.3.2021 passed by the Learned Senior Civil Judge, Panaji, in Special Civil Suit No. 30/2010/A.

2. The order came to be passed on 9.3.21. The application for certified copy of the order was preferred on 10.03.2021 and the same was ready and received on 20.03.2021. The

Appeal was filed on 30/10/21; thus, there is a delay of 133 days in filing the First Appeal

3. It is further submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide order dated 23.03.2020, directed the extension of the limitation period in all proceedings before the Courts/Tribunals, including the Supreme Court w.e.f. 15.03.2020 till 14.03.2021 was excluded. Thereafter, the order dated 23.03.2020 was restored by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 24.03.2021, due to second surge in COVID-19, and it was clarified that the period from 14.03.2021 onwards shall stand excluded till further orders. Thereafter, the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide its order dated 23.09.2021 has clarified that the period between 15.03.2020 and 28.02.2022 has been excluded for the purpose of computing limitation under general and special laws.

4. Considering the above, the Applicant is therefore justified in stating that there is sufficient cause made out for condoning the delay.

5. It is also submitted that the Applicant has a good case on

merits and that denial of condonation would result in grave prejudice and render the appeal infructuous.

6. The Ld. Senior Counsel for the Respondent Nos.2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 has fairly not objected to delay being condoned.

7. Upon perusal of the application and the grounds stated therein, and considering the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is of the opinion that sufficient cause has been made out for condoning the delay. Accordingly, the Application is allowed. The delay of 133 days in filing the First Appeal is hereby condoned in the interest of justice.

8. The Application stands disposed of.

**SHREERAM V. SHIRSAT, J.**