



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

CWP-19064-2025

Date of Decision: 11.07.2025

DAI RAM

..... Petitioner

Versus

**HARYANA VIDYUT PRASARAN NIGAM LIMITED AND
OTHERS**

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.V.D. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Prince Singh, Advocate for the respondents.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioner through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India is seeking setting aside of order dated 04.10.2024 (Annexure P-6) whereby he has been denied benefit of 2nd ACP.

2. The petitioner was discharged from Military Service in June' 1970. He joined office of respondent as Security Guard on 10.12.1971 under Ex-serviceman category. He was regularized on 28.03.1973. He retired on 30.06.1999. The respondent notified scheme of ACP w.e.f. 01.01.1996. The ACP Rules were modified vide order dated 20.02.2004. Few employees filed CWP No.14580 of 2006 before this Court seeking revision of pension. This Court disposed of said petition vide order dated 07.05.2008 with a direction to re-calculate retiral benefits. The petitioner served legal notice dated 24.01.2024 claiming benefit of 2nd ACP. He



preferred CWP No.13106 of 2024 before this Court which was disposed of with a direction to decide legal notice. The respondent vide order dated 04.10.2024 has rejected his claim.

3. On being asked, learned counsel for the petitioner expressed his inability to advance any plausible reason for the delay, however, submitted that it is a recurring cause.

4. The petitioner retired on 30.06.1999. The benefit of ACP accrued to him in 2004. Similarly situated employees filed writ petition before this Court in 2006 which was disposed of in May' 2008. The respondent on 20.09.2017 issued another order with respect to re-calculation of retiral benefits. The petitioner served legal notice in January' 2024. There was inordinate delay in serving legal notice and thereafter approaching this Court.

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 Vs. 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 non-suited or in other words writ petition ought to have been dismissed on the ground of delay and laches 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 laches 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. There is no question of delay. 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 petition on the ground that writ petition has been filed after a long time from the date of retirement.



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.

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 he wants to make hay while the Sun shines. Case of the petitioner is badly hit by doctrine of delay and laches.

10. Applying the aforesaid judgments, this Court finds no explanation for delay in the instant case. By serving legal notice, he has attempted to revive lapsed cause of action. The present petition deserves to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

11.07.2025
Ali

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No