



CWP-18537-2025

-1-

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

118

CWP-18537-2025

Date of Decision: 08.07.2025

Balkar Singh**...Petitioner****Versus****State of Punjab and others****...Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL**

Present: - Mr. Balbir Singh Jaswal, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Aman Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking direction to respondents to consider him for promotion from the date his junior Nirmal Singh was promoted.
2. The petitioner joined Punjab Police as Constable on 04.12.1981. From time to time, he was promoted. He retired as Assistant Sub-Inspector on 30.06.2015.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner as well as his junior Nirmal Singh passed Lower School Course in 1992. Nirmal Singh joined service on 08.09.1983. Both petitioner and Nirmal Singh were promoted as Assistant Sub-Inspector in 2010. However, while Nirmal Singh was further promoted to the rank of Sub-Inspector in 2014, the petitioner was not extended the benefit of such promotion.



4. The petitioner retired on 30.06.2015 and cause of action, if any, arose in 2014. A period of 11 years has passed away from the date of cause of action. On being asked reason of inordinate delay in approaching this court, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that action of the respondents has affected retiral benefits of the petitioner, thus, there is recurring cause, thus, writ petition is maintainable.

5. No hard and fast rule can be laid down as to when the High Court should refuse to exercise its jurisdiction in favour of a party who moves it after considerable delay and is otherwise guilty of laches. Discretion must be exercised judiciously and reasonably. In the event that the claim made by the applicant is legally sustainable, delay should be condoned. Where illegality is manifest, it cannot be sustained on the sole ground of laches. When substantial justice and technical considerations are pitted against each other, the cause of substantial justice deserves to be preferred. State cannot deprive vested right because of a non-deliberate delay.

6. A two Judge Bench of Supreme Court recently in ***Mrinmoy Maity v. Chhanda Koley and others, 2024 SCC OnLine SC 551*** has held that High Court ought to dismiss petition on the ground of delay and laches where there is no explanation of delay. An applicant who approaches the Court belatedly or in the other words sleeps over his rights for a considerable period ought not to be granted the extraordinary relief by writ Courts. Delay defeats equity. High Court may refuse to invoke its writ jurisdiction if laxity on the part of applicant has allowed the cause of action to drift away and attempts are made to rekindle the lapsed cause of action. Multiple



communications cannot create cause of action. The relevant extracts of the judgment are reproduced as below:

“9. Having heard rival contentions raised and on perusal of the facts obtained in the present case, we are of the considered view that writ petitioner ought to have been nonsuited or in other words writ petition ought to have been dismissed on the ground of delay and latches itself. An applicant who approaches the court belatedly or in other words sleeps over his rights for a considerable period of time, wakes up from his deep slumber ought not to be granted the extraordinary relief by the writ courts. This Court time and again has held that delay defeats equity. Delay or latches is one of the factors which should be born in mind by the High Court while exercising discretionary powers under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. In a given case, the High Court may refuse to invoke its extraordinary powers if laxity on the part of the applicant to assert his right has allowed the cause of action to drift away and attempts are made subsequently to rekindle the lapsed cause of action.

10. The discretion to be exercised would be with care and caution. If the delay which has occasioned in approaching the writ court is explained which would appeal to the conscience of the court, in such circumstances it cannot be gainsaid by the contesting party that for all times to come the delay is not to be condoned. There may be myriad circumstances which gives rise to the invoking of the extraordinary jurisdiction and it all depends on facts and circumstances of each case, same cannot be described in a straight jacket formula with mathematical precision. The ultimate discretion to be exercised by the writ court depends upon the facts that it has to travel or the terrain in which the facts have travelled.



11. For filing of a writ petition, there is no doubt that no fixed period of limitation is prescribed. However, when the extraordinary jurisdiction of the writ court is invoked, it has to be seen as to whether within a reasonable time same has been invoked and even submitting of memorials would not revive the dead cause of action or resurrect the cause of action which has had a natural death. In such circumstances on the ground of delay and latches alone, the appeal ought to be dismissed or the applicant ought to be non-suited. If it is found that the writ petitioner is guilty of delay and latches, the High Court ought to dismiss the petition on that sole ground itself, in as much as the writ courts are not to indulge in permitting such indolent litigant to take advantage of his own wrong. It is true that there cannot be any waiver of fundamental right but while exercising discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226, the High Court will have to necessarily take into consideration the delay and latches on the part of the applicant in approaching a writ court.”

7. The petitioner claims that his cause is recurring in nature, thus, writ is maintainable. A Division Bench of this Court vide judgment dated 04.04.2018 in ***Kartar Singh v. Managing Director, HVPNL and others, CWP No.26962 of 2015***, after noticing various judgments of Apex Court has dismissed similar contention.

8. A Coordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 03.05.2015 in ***Sandeep Kharab v. State of Haryana and others, CWP No. 5965 of 2011***; order dated 04.09.2012 in ***Bal Krishan v. State of Punjab and others, CWP No.18498 of 2011*** and order 29.11.2012 in ***Tarsem Pal v. Punjab State Power Corporation Limited and others, CWP No.13965 of 2010*** has dismissed petitions on the ground that writ jurisdiction cannot be invoked at the will and convenience of the litigant. Anyone who claims rights must be vigilant and he must enforce his rights within reasonable time.

**CWP-18537-2025****-5-**

9. There is no explanation for delay and as per the petitioner, he can approach Court at any point of time because he has a recurring cause. The petitioner by his act and conduct acquiesced action of the respondent and at this belated stage, want to make hay while the sun shines. Case of the petitioner is badly hit by doctrine of delay and laches.

10. In the wake of afore-cited judgment and considering inordinate delay on the part of petitioner, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke its extra-ordinary writ jurisdiction. The present petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

08.07.2025
Mohit Kumar

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