



116

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

CWP-35215-2024**Date of Decision: 07.01.2025****VIKAS KUMAR AND OTHERS**

..... Petitioners

*Versus***STATE OF HARYANA OTHERS**

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr. Narender K. Sharma, Advocate with
Ms. Suman Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking direction to respondents to extend them employment in view of policy decision.

2. The State of Haryana in 1984 declared a policy with respect to acquisition of land. As per said policy, the owners/family members of owners of the land were entitled to job in case of acquisition of their land. A similar policy dated 07.04.1992 came to be framed by Panipat Thermal Power Plant. As per said policy, the Power Plant had to give job to a family member whose land is acquired. The land of forefathers of petitioners came to be acquired by Panipat Thermal Power Plant in 1992. As per policy, the Power Plant extended employment to many owners of land, however, no job was offered to forefathers of the petitioners. The petitioners, at this stage, are claiming employment on the ground that land of their forefathers was acquired, however, they were not given job as per policy.



3. Mr. Narender K. Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners submits that petitioners have made representation before the respondent seeking employment in terms of aforesaid policy. The policy was framed in 1992 and land was also acquired in 1992. A period of more than 32 years from the date of acquisition of land has passed away. It is not a case of the petitioners that their forefathers were not paid compensation at the time of acquisition of land. There may be so many reasons for not extending job which includes denial on the part of forefathers of the petitioners.

4. This Court, at this belated stage, especially when there is no reasonable explanation for delay of more than three decades, cannot ask the State or its instrumentality to consider claim of petitioners for employment.

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. Applying the aforesaid judgment, this Court finds no explanation for delay in the instant case. The present petition deserves to be dismissed on the ground of delay and laches and accordingly dismissed.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

07.01.2025
Ali

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