



1

**CRM-47944-2024 in/and
CRR-2449-2024 (O&M)**

258

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

**CRM-47944-2024 in/and
CRR-2449-2024 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.01.2025**

HARDEEP SINGH ALIAS HONEY

.. Applicant/Petitioner

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB

..Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Vikram Jeet Singh, Advocate for applicant/petitioner.

...

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. The present application has been filed on behalf of the applicant-petitioner seeking condonation of delay of 1680 days in filing the accompanying revision petition. The main revision petition has been filed impugning the judgment dated 27.04.2018 passed by learned Addl. Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar, whereby charge under Sections 307, 323, 324, 325, 506 and 34 of IPC have wrongly been framed against the petitioner and other co-accused.

2. Learned counsel appearing for the applicant-petitioner, while seeking grant of prayer for condonation of delay of 1680 days, has argued that the delay has occurred as the applicant-petitioner did not have the knowledge about the challenging of the impugned order dated 27.04.2018 and hence was unable to take immediate steps. Thereupon, after arranging the counsel, the instant revision petition had been filed. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner has further argued that the circumstances of the case



**CRM-47944-2024 in/and
CRR-2449-2024 (O&M)**

indicate that the delay in filing the revision petition is neither intentional nor deliberate hence the delay deserves to be condoned.

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

A liberal approach, undoubtedly, ought to be accorded to a plea for condonation of delay made under Section 5 of The Limitation Act, 1969 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



**CRM-47944-2024 in/and
CRR-2449-2024 (O&M)**

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 ***'State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Ramkumar Choudhary', Neutral Citation: 2024 INSC 932***, has observed as under:

"The legal position is that where a case has been presented in the Court beyond limitation, the petitioner has to explain the Court as to what was the "sufficient cause" which means an adequate and enough reason which prevented him to approach the Court within limitation. In Majji Sannemma v. Reddy Sridevi, it was held by this Court that even though limitation may harshly affect the rights of a party, it has to be applied with all its rigour when prescribed by statute. A reference was also made to the decision of this Court in Ajay Dabra v. Pyare Ram wherein, it was held as follows:

"13. This Court in the case of Basawaraj v. Special Land Acquisition Officer ((2013) 14 SCC 81] while rejecting an application for condonation of delay for lack of sufficient cause has concluded in Paragraph 15 as follows:

"15. The law on the issue can be summarised to the effect that where a case has been presented in the court beyond limitation, the applicant has to explain the court as to what was the "sufficient cause" which means an adequate and enough reason which prevented him to approach the court within limitation. In case a party is found to be negligent, or for want of bona fide on his part in the facts and circumstances of the case, or found to have not acted diligently or remained inactive, there cannot be a justified ground to condone the delay. No court could be justified in condoning such an inordinate delay by imposing any condition whatsoever. The application is to be decided only within the parameters laid down by this Court in regard to the condonation of delay. In case there was no sufficient cause to prevent a litigant to approach the court on time condoning the delay without any justification, putting any condition whatsoever, amounts to passing an order in violation of the statutory provisions and it tantamounts to showing utter disregard to the legislature.

14. Therefore, we are of the considered opinion that the High Court did not commit any mistake in dismissing the delay condonation application of the present appellant."

Thus, it is crystal clear that the discretion to condone the delay has to be exercised judiciously based on facts and circumstances of each case and that, the expression 'sufficient cause' cannot be liberally interpreted, if negligence, inaction or lack of bona fides is attributed to the party."



**CRM-47944-2024 in/and
CRR-2449-2024 (O&M)**

6. Further, 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 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."

7. Condonation of delay of 1680 days in filing the accompanying revision petition is sought for on the following relevant averments:

"2. That the petitioner being a layman was not aware about the remedy available to him against the impugned order dated 27.04.2018 passed by Ld. Additional Sessions Judge, SBS Nagar. The petitioner met with undersigned counsel in the first week of November, 2024 and then only he came to know about the filing of the Crl. Revision petition before this Hon'ble Court against the order dated 27.04.2018. Therefore, delay of 1680 days has occurred in filing the accompanying Crl. Revision.

3. The aforesaid delay of 1680 days in filing the Crl. Revision is neither intentional nor deliberate, but occurred due to the aforementioned unavoidable reasons."

8. 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 1680 days in filing the accompanying revision petition. 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 1680 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

**CRM-47944-2024 in/and
CRR-2449-2024 (O&M)**

substantiate these claims, does not meet the legal threshold for condonation. The applicant has neither shown continuous interest in the case nor presented any exceptional or unavoidable circumstances that could explain such an extensive delay.

8.1 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 1680 days in filing the accompanying revision petition merits dismissal.

Decision

9. The application (CRM-47944-2024) seeking condonation of delay of 1680 days in filing the accompanying revision petition is dismissed. Since the application seeking condonation of delay has been dismissed, the accompanying revision petition stands dismissed as well accordingly.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

09.01.2025
Jasmine Kaur

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No