

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

2025.PHHC.157018



142

**CRM-13653-2023 in/&
CRR-780-2023 (O&M)**

Date of decision: 13.11.2025

Reshma

....Applicant/Petitioner

V/s

State of Haryana & another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Gaurav Grover, Advocate for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Addl.AG, Haryana.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

CRM-13653-2023

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the applicant-petitioner seeking condonation of delay of 216 days in filing the accompanying revision petition. The main revision petition has been filed impugning the judgment dated 18.01.2021, passed by the learned Sessions Judge, Panipat vide which the appeal preferred by the petitioner (herein) against the order dated 22.10.2018 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Panipat whereby respondent No.2 was ordered to be acquitted from the charges, has been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant-petitioner, while seeking grant of prayer for condonation of delay of 216 days, has argued that that the applicant-petitioner is the sole earning member of her family and there was no other person available to take necessary steps for filing the present revision. He has further argued that moreover the counsel appearing before

the learned Appellate Court did not inform the applicant-petitioner regarding the decision of the case, and due to the restrictions imposed during the Covid period and other unavoidable circumstances, further delay occurred in filing the revision. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner has further submitted that an application for condonation of delay ought to be considered liberally, particularly, where the applicant-petitioner has good case on merits. 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. On these submissions, condonation of delay of 216 days in filing the revision petition has been sought.

3. I have heard the learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner as also learned State counsel 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:

I.A liberal approach, undoubtedly, ought to be accorded to a plea for condonation of delay made under Section 5 of The Limitation Act, 1963 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 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 ***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

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.”

6. Condonation of delay of 216 days in filing the accompanying revision petition is sought for on the following relevant averments:

“1. That the petitioner is filing the accompanying revision in this Hon'ble Court and the same is likely to succeed on the grounds mentioned in the revision. The grounds of revision may also be read as a part of this application.

2. That the petitioner only one to take care of family and no one in family to proceed further to file revision and counsel not inform him as case decided and later on Covid restriction for filling, later on so delay incurred.

3. That in the above said circumstances, a delay of 216 days in filing of revision has occasioned and the same may kindly be condoned.”

7. A perusal of the above-said averments clearly show that no reasonable or plausible explanation has been furnished by the applicant-petitioner to condone the delay of 216 days in filing the accompanying revision petition. This application, apart from bereft of any specific details/particulars which may reflect *bona fide* on part of the applicant-petitioner in pursuing his case, rather reflects a deliberate attempt on part of the applicant-petitioner to somehow entangle the respondents-accused in prolonged litigation. The applicant-petitioner 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 216 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-petitioner has neither shown continuous interest in the case nor presented any exceptional or unavoidable circumstances that could explain such an extensive delay.

7.1 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 216 days in filing the accompanying revision petition merits dismissal.

Decision

8. The application (*CRM-13653-2023*) seeking condonation of delay of 216 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.
9. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

November 13, 2025
Naveen

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No