



105
IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

LPA-617-2026 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 23.04.2026

KULVIR KAUR AND OTHERS

....Appellant(s)

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR

Present: Mr. Nitish Singla, Advocate,
for the appellant.

JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (Oral)

CM-1541-LPA-2026

1. The present application has been filed for condonation of delay of 791 days in filing the present appeal.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the applicants submitted that there has been a delay of 791 days in filing the present appeal and the reasons for delay, as mentioned in the application, are that although the impugned judgment was passed on 21.11.2023 but the applicants being simple Government employees from rural backgrounds thought that the Government will implement the judgment and give them full benefits and by way of the impugned judgment, the full benefits were not given to the applicants and another reason mentioned in the application is that there are 25 applicants and there was no coordination among them and it took time to contact all the 25 applicants for fixing a common date to



engage a counsel and therefore, the delay caused was *bona fide* in nature and the same may be condoned.

3. We have heard the learned counsel for the applicants and have perused the present application for condonation of delay.

4. For condonation of delay under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, the applicants have to show and satisfy that there has to be a sufficient cause seeking condonation of delay. The two reasons which have been as grounds for condonation of delay as stated by the learned counsel for the applicants are that the applicants are simple Government employees from rural backgrounds. This reason to the mind of this Court would not constitute a sufficient cause. Second ground which has been taken was that there are 25 applicants and it took time for them to coordinate with each other for engaging a counsel. This Court is of the considered view that the aforesaid ground would not constitute a sufficient cause. Apart from the above, this Court also has to consider the length of delay in filing of the present appeal. The appeal has been filed after a large delay of 791 days and the aforesaid two grounds do not constitute a sufficient cause within the meaning of Section 5 of the Limitation Act. Accordingly, the present application for condonation of delay is hereby dismissed.

9. Since the application for condonation of delay has been dismissed, the main appeal is also dismissed.

(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)
JUDGE

(YASHVIR SINGH RATHOR)
JUDGE

23.04.2026

rakesh

Whether speaking

: Yes/No

Whether reportable

: Yes/No