



RSA-5941-2018 (O&M)

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

**RSA-5941-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision : 15.07.2025**

Daljit Singh Grewal

....Appellant

Versus

Ram Singh

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present:- Mr. Rajesh Punj, Advocate and
Mr. Sahaj Punj, Advocate
for the appellant.

PANKAJ JAIN, J.(ORAL)

1 Plaintiff is in second appeal aggrieved of the judgment and decree passed by the Courts below.

2 The sole question involved in the present appeal is as to when the limitation to file the present suit could commence. In order to ascertain the same the prayer made in the plaint needs to be perused. The same reads as under :-

“Suit for recovery of ₹5,00,000/- under the law of tort on account of damages and injury to the reputation and profession suffered by the plaintiff and also on account of uncalled for expenses incurred on litigation by the plaintiff on account of deliberate and intentional false defamation and slander of the character and reputation of the plaintiff by the defendant.”



RSA-5941-2018 (O&M)

3 Evidently, the suit is based on the law of tort, seeking damages for harm to the plaintiff’s reputation and profession, allegedly caused by slander and libel, which he claims are false and arise from the registration of an FIR. The FIR came into being on 16.01.2001. In the considered opinion of this Court, the limitation would be governed by Article 75 and 76 of the Limitation Act, 1963 (for short ‘the 1963 Act’) which read as under :-

	<i>Description of suit</i>	<i>Period of limitation</i>	<i>Time from which period begins to run</i>
75.	<i>For compensation for libel.</i>	<i>One year.</i>	<i>When the libel is published.</i>
76	<i>For compensation for slander.</i>	<i>One year.</i>	<i>When the words are spoken, or, if the words are not actionable in themselves, when the special damage complained of results.</i>

4 The present suit was instituted on 14.02.2002. The plaintiff has been non-suited by both the courts below on the ground of limitation.

5 Counsel for the appellant submits that the limitation would commence from the day the cancellation report was accepted by the competent Court and the accusations as leveled in the FIR were proved to be false. He further submits that it is only when the cancellation report was accepted that the cause of action in favour of the plaintiff arose and thus the limitation would commence from the said date only.

6 In the considered opinion of this Court, the argument raised is misconceived. Under Article 75 and 76 of the 1963 Act, the limitation starts to run from the day the libel is published or the slander is spoken.

7 In view thereof, this Court does not find any reason to interfere in the well reasoned judgments passed by the Courts below and the same is ordered to be dismissed.

RSA-5941-2018 (O&M)

8 Pending miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed off.

15.07.2025
Pooja Sharma-I

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

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