



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED: 11.11.2025

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **SHAMIM AHMED**

CRL.M.P.(MD)No.11735 of 2025

in

CRL.R.C.(MD)SR.No.24849 of 2025

1.Sureshkumar,
S/o. Ayyasamy,
North Ayyankovil Street,
Chinnamanur, Theni District.

2.Arunkumar,
S/o.Ayyasamy
North Ayyankovil Street,
Chinnamanur, Theni District.

3.Palaniyammal,
W/o. Ayyasamy,
North Ayyankovil Street,
Chinnamanur, Theni District.

4.Sulochana,
W/o.Maharajan,
North Ayyankovil Street
Chinnamanur, Theni District.

... Petitioners

vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by The Inspector of Police,
Chinnamanur North Police Station,
Theni District.
(Crime No.343 of 2023)

... Respondent



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

PRAYER: Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, to condone the delay of 102 days in preferring the Criminal Revision against the order in Cr.M.P.No.5037 of 2024 in C.C.No.54 of 2024 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Uthamapalayam.

For Petitioners :No appearance

For Respondent :Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad
Government Advocate

ORDER

The present Criminal Miscellaneous Petition has been filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, to condone the delay of 102 days in filing the Criminal Revision Case against the order of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Uthamapalayam, passed in Cr.M.P.No.5037 of 2024 in CC.No.54 of 2024, dated 13.12.2024.

2.Heard Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad, learned Government Advocate for the respondent.

3.The facts of case, in a nutshell, led to filing of this Petition and necessary for disposal of same, are as follows:-



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

a) One Palpandi, who was the President of Chinnamanur Devendra

Kula Vellalar Uravinmurai, is the uncle of the defacto complainant. On 03.08.2023, at around 11.00 pm., the petitioners along with other accused persons gathered in front of the said Palpandi's father's house with deadly weapons and by using filthy language threw stones on the said house. Further, the accused persons broke open the defacto complainant's shop and took Rs.2,00,000/-. Hence, an FIR came to be registered in Crime No.343 of 2023 by the respondent Police and the respondent police, after completing the investigation, had filed the final report against the petitioners for the offences under Sections 147, 148, 294(b), 427, 506(ii) r/w 149 IPC and the case was taken on file in C.C.No.54 of 2024 by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Uthamapalayam. Thereafter, the petitioners had filed a petition in Crl.M.P.No.5037 of 2024 before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Uthamapalayam, to discharge them from the said Criminal Case.

b) The learned Judicial Magistrate, Uthamapalayam, upon considering the evidence both oral and documentary and on hearing the arguments of both the sides, vide order dated 13.12.2024, had dismissed the said petition. However, due to poverty, the petitioners were unable to



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

file the present Criminal Revision Petition within the stipulated time, resulting in a delay of 102 days. Hence, the impugned order made in Cr.M.P.No.5037 of 2024 in CC.No.54 of 2024, dated 13.12.2024 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Uthamapalayam, is under challenge in the present Criminal Revision Petition along with the delay condonation petition.

4.From the perusal of the records, it is seen that when the matter came up for hearing on 02.09.2025 and 06.10.2025, Mr.P.Chinnaraja, learned counsel for the petitioners prayed for an adjournment and on the request made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the case was adjourned. However, today, when the case was called in the revised call, Mr.P.Chinnaraja, learned counsel for the petitioners is not present. Thus, it appears that the petitioners are not interested in pursuing the present Criminal Miscellaneous Petition. The order passed on 02.09.2025 is being reproduced herein below:-

Mr.P.Chinnaraja, learned Counsel for the petitioner prays some more time to prepare the case.

2.Mr.M.Karunanithi, learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the respondent has no objection to the prayer



made by the learned Counsel for the petitioner.

3. Accordingly, as prayed for by the learned Counsel for the petitioner, adjournment is allowed.

4. Put up this case on 06.10.2025 before the appropriate Bench.

The order passed on 06.10.2025 is also being reproduced herein below:-

Mr.P.Chinnaraja, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that he could not get the medical documents to justify the delay in filing the present Criminal Revision Petition. Hence, he submits that he may be given some further time to file medical documents.

2.Mr.M.Karunanithi, learned Government Advocate (Crl.side), for the respondent has no objection to the aforesaid prayer made by the learned counsel for the petitioners.

3. Accordingly, as a last opportunity, a further period of two weeks and no more further time is granted to the petitioner to file medical documents in support of the delay condonation application.

4. Put up this case "For Orders" on 11.11.2025 before the appropriate Bench.



5.Mr.A.S.Abul Kalam Azad, learned Government Advocate for the

Respondent, submits that the Criminal Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act is, *prima facie*, not legally maintainable. He further contends that the miscellaneous petition seeking condonation of the inordinate delay of 102 days in filing the criminal revision petition is liable to be dismissed.

6.I have given my careful and anxious consideration to the contentions put forward by the learned Government Advocate for the respondent and also perused the entire materials available on record.

7.The matter comes up for consideration of application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act with a prayer for condoning the delay of 102 days in filing the Criminal Revision Petition.

8.The standard period of limitation for filing a Criminal Revision Petition under Section 438 of BNSS Act, 2023, is 90 days from the date of the impugned order, as stipulated under Article 131 of the Limitation Act, 1963. In the present case, the Criminal Revision Petitions have been



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

filed with a delay of 102 days. However, under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963, the Court is empowered to condone the delay, if the petitioner is able to demonstrate "sufficient cause" for not preferring the revision within the prescribed limitation period. The explanation offered must be reasonable, *bona fide*, and not indicative of negligence or inaction.

9. After perusal of the records, this Court finds that there is neither a satisfactory explanation nor any reasons for the inordinate delay of 102 days in filing the present Criminal Revision Petitions, seeking condonation of delay. Hence, the petition is time-barred and cannot be sustained on the ground of laches.

10. The expression "sufficient cause" and satisfactory explanation has been held to receive a liberal construction so as to advance substantial justice and generally a delay in preferring a petition may be condoned in the interest of justice, where no gross negligence or deliberate inaction or lack of *bona fide* is imputable to parties, seeking condonation of delay. In the case of ***Collector, Land Acquisition Vs.***



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

Katiji, reported in 1987 (2) SCC 107, the Honourable Supreme Court

WEB COPY said that when substantial justice and technical considerations are taken against each other, cause of substantial justice deserves to be preferred, for, the other side cannot claim to have vested right in injustice being done because of a non deliberate delay. The Court further said that judiciary is respected not on account of its power to legalise injustice on technical grounds, but because it is capable of removing injustice and is expected to do so.

11. In the case of ***P.K. Ramachandran Vs. State of Kerala, reported in AIR 1998 SC 2276***, the Honourable Supreme Court was pleased to observe as under:-

“Law of limitation may harshly affect a particular party but it has to be applied with all its rigour when the statute so prescribe and the Courts have no power to extend the period of limitation on equitable grounds.”

12. The Rules of limitation are not meant to destroy rights of parties. They virtually take away the remedy. They are meant with the objective that parties should not resort to dilatory tactics and sleep over



their rights. They must seek remedy promptly. The object of providing a legal remedy is to repair the damage caused by reason of legal injury. The statute relating to limitation determines a life span for such legal remedy for redress of the legal injury, one has suffered. Time is precious and the wasted time would never revisit. During efflux of time, newer causes would come up, necessitating newer persons to seek legal remedy by approaching the Courts. So a life span must be fixed for each remedy. Unending period for launching the remedy may lead to unending uncertainty and consequential anarchy. The statute providing limitation is founded on public policy. It is enshrined in the maxim ***Interest reipublicae up sit finis litium*** (it is for the general welfare that a period be put to litigation). It is for this reason that when an action becomes barred by time, the Court should be slow to ignore delay for the reason that once limitation expires, other party matures his rights on the subject with attainment of finality. Though it cannot be doubted that refusal to condone delay would result in foreclosing the suiter from putting forth his cause but simultaneously the party on the other hand is also entitled to sit and feel carefree after a particular length of time, getting relieved from persistent and continued litigation.



WEB COPY

13. There is no presumption that delay in approaching the Court is always deliberate. No person gains from deliberate delaying a matter by not resorting to take appropriate legal remedy within time but then the words “sufficient cause“ show that delay, if any, occurred, should not be deliberate, negligent and due to casual approach of concerned litigant, but, it should be bona fide, and, for the reasons beyond his control, and, in any case should not lack bona fide. If the explanation does not smack of lack of bona fide, the Court should show due consideration to the litigant, but, when there is apparent casual approach on the part of litigant, the approach of Court is also bound to change. Lapse on the part of litigant in approaching Court within time is understandable but a total inaction for long period of delay without any explanation whatsoever and that too in the absence of showing any sincere attempt on the part of litigant, would add to his negligence, and would be relevant factor going against him.

14. I need not to burden this judgment with a catena of decisions explaining and laying down as to what should be the approach of Court



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

on construing “sufficient cause” and it would be suffice to refer a very few of them besides those already referred.

15. In the case of **Shakuntala Devi Jain Vs. Kuntal Kumari, reported, AIR 1969 SC 575**, a three Judge Bench of the Court said that unless want of bona fide of such inaction or negligence as would deprive a party of the protection, the application must not be thrown out or any delay cannot be refused to be condoned.

16. The **Privy Council, in the case of Brij Indar Singh Vs. Kanshi Ram reported in ILR (1918) 45 Cal 94**, observed that true guide for a court to exercise the discretion is whether the appellant acted with reasonable diligence in prosecuting the appeal. This principle still holds good inasmuch as the aforesaid decision of Privy Council as repeatedly been referred to, and, recently in **State of Nagaland Vs. Lipok AO and others, AIR 2005 SC 2191**.

17. In the case of **Vedabai @ Vijayanatabai Baburao Vs. Shantaram Baburao Patil and others, reported in JT 2001 (5) SC**



608, the Court said that under Section 5 of the Act, 1963, it should adopt a pragmatic approach. A distinction must be made between a case where the delay is inordinate and a case where the delay is of a few days. In the former case consideration of prejudice to the other side will be a relevant factor so the case calls for a more cautious approach but in the latter case no such consideration may arise and such a case deserves a liberal approach. No hard and fast rule can be laid down in this regard and the basic guiding factor is advancement of substantial justice.

18. In the case of **Pundlik Jalam Patil (dead) by LRS. Vs. Executive Engineer, Jalgaon Medium Project and Another**, reported in **(2008) 17 SCC 448**, in para 17 of the judgment, the Court said :-

“...The evidence on record suggests neglect of its own right for long time in preferring appeals. The court cannot enquire into belated and state claims on the ground of equity. Delay defeats equity. The court helps those who are vigilant and “do not slumber over their rights.”

19. In the case of **Maniben Devraj Shah Vs. Municipal Corporation of Brihan Mumbai**, reported in **2012 (5) SCC 157**, in para 18 of the judgment, the Court said as under:-



“What needs to be emphasized is that even though a liberal and justice oriented approach is required to be adopted in the exercise of power under Section 5 of the Limitation Act and other similar statutes, the Courts can neither become oblivious of the fact that the successful litigant has acquired certain rights on the basis of the judgment under challenge and a lot of time is consumed at various stages of litigation apart from the cost. What colour the expression “sufficient cause” would get in the factual matrix of a given case would largely depend on bona fide nature of the explanation. If the Court finds that there has been no negligence on the part of the applicant and the cause shown for the delay does not lack bonafides, then it may condone the delay. If, on the other hand, the explanation given by the applicant is found to be concocted or he is thoroughly negligent in prosecuting his cause, then it would be a legitimate exercise of discretion not to condone the delay. In cases involving the State and its agencies/instrumentalities, the Court can take note of the fact that sufficient time is taken in the decision making process but no premium can be given for total lethargy or utter negligence on the part of the officers of the State and / or its agencies/instrumentalities and the applications filed by them for condonation of delay cannot be allowed as a matter of course by accepting the plea that dismissal of the matter on the ground of bar of limitation will cause injury to the public interest.”

20. After taking into consideration the averments made in the application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act and after hearing the learned Government Advocate, this Court is not satisfied that the Petitioners have explained the delay in filing the present Criminal Revision Petition.



21. In my view, the kind of explanation rendered herein does not satisfy the observations of the Honourable Supreme Court that if delay has occurred for reasons, which does not smack of mala fide, the Court should be reluctant to refuse condonation. On the contrary, I find that here is a case, which shows complete careless and reckless long delay on the part of the Petitioners, which has remain virtually unexplained at all. Therefore, I do not find any reason to exercise my judicial discretion exercising judiciously so as to justify the condonation of delay in the present case.

22. In the result, in the light of the above said observations and discussions made above and in the light of the decisions referred to above, this Criminal Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act with a prayer for condoning the delay of 102 days in filing the Criminal Revision Petition is baseless and the same is hereby rejected.

23. In view of the above, the Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is **dismissed**, as devoid of merits. There is no order as to costs.



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

WEB COPY 24. Accordingly, in view of the above discussion and legal position, the present Criminal Revision Petition is dismissed.

Index :Yes / No
Internet :Yes / No
NCC :Yes / No

11.11.2025

mm

To

The Judicial Magistrate, Uthamapalayam.



WEB COPY



CRL.R.C.(MD)No.1207 of 2025

SHAMIM AHMED, J.

mm

CRL.M.P.(MD)No.11735 of 2025

in

CRL.R.C.(MD)SR.No.24849 of 2025

11.11.2025