



CM-5248 & 5249-CWP-2026 in  
RA-CW-172-2026 in  
CWP-18458-2018

-1-

118

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

\*\*\*\*

**CM-5248 & 5249-CWP-2026 in/and  
RA-CW-172-2026 in  
CWP-18458-2018**

**Date of Decision: 16.04.2026**

\*\*\*\*

Jai Singh

..... Applicant/Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Non-applicants/Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASGURPREET SINGH PURI**

Present: Mr. Sita Ram Barvaria, Advocate,  
for the applicant/petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**JASGURPREET SINGH PURI, J. (ORAL)**

**CM-5248-CWP-2026**

For the reasons mentioned in the application, the same is allowed and the documents as Annexures A-1 to A-5 are taken on record, subject to all just exceptions.

**CM-5249-CWP-2026 &  
RA-172-2026**

1. These are two applications filed by the applicant/petitioner. The first application has been filed seeking condonation of delay of 571 days in filing the present review application and the second application has been filed seeking review of the order dated 19.07.2024 passed by this Court whereby the petition filed by the applicant/petitioner was allowed in terms of the judgment passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP-26704-2015** titled as “**Ram Swarup Vs. State of Haryana and others**”, decided on 10.07.2019.



CM-5248 & 5249-CWP-2026 in  
RA-CW-172-2026 in  
CWP-18458-2018

-2-

2. Learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner has submitted that the aforesaid order passed by this Court on 19.07.2024 deserves to be reviewed by this Court in view of certain instructions/letters which have been attached with the review application. These documents establish that the applicant/petitioner was entitled to a higher rate of interest, which would also be compoundable in nature. He further submitted that at that point of time, the various instructions attached to the present review application were not within the knowledge of the applicant/petitioner and it was only upon receiving the final installment and verifying the calculations that he realized the respondents had released the amount @ 6% per annum on a simple interest basis. Therefore, the present application has been filed for review of the aforesaid order passed by this Court

3. I have heard learned counsel for the applicant/petitioner.

4. The order under review dated 19.07.2024 is reproduced as under:-

*“1. At the outset, learned counsels for the parties are ad idem and have submitted that the relief claimed in the present petition is squarely covered by a judgment passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in **CWP-26704-2015** titled as **“Ram Sawrup Vs. State of Haryana and others”** decided on 10.07.2019, wherein the charge-sheets were quashed because there were no norms fixed for showing any less gain in the moisture and submitted that the present petition may also be allowed in the same terms.*

*2. In view of the aforesaid joint submission made by the learned counsels for the parties, the present petition is disposed of in the same terms as CWP-26704-2015.”*



CM-5248 & 5249-CWP-2026 in  
RA-CW-172-2026 in  
CWP-18458-2018

-3-

5. A perusal of the aforesaid would show that the learned counsels for the parties were *ad idem* at the time of passing of the aforesaid order that the present petition may be disposed of being squarely covered by the judgment passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***Ram Swarup's case (Supra)*** and had also submitted that the present petition may be allowed in the same terms. It was on the submission and request made by both the learned counsels for the parties that the present petition was disposed of in the same terms as ***Ram Swarup's case (Supra)***. In the aforesaid judgment passed in ***Ram Swarup's case (Supra)***, interest was granted @6% per annum (simple).

6. Now, the present review application has been filed after a delay of 571 days seeking condonation thereof on the ground that the applicant/petitioner realized upon receipt of final installment that the interest had been calculated @6% per annum which is so depicted in Para No.2(3) of the application for condonation of delay. It is very strange that once the aforesaid order was passed on the consent of both the learned counsels for the parties, wherein it was clearly allowed in terms of the aforesaid judgment which granted interest on the amount @ 6% per annum (simple) then how the applicant/petitioner claims to have become aware of this only upon receipt of the final installment. Such kind of argument and the ground taken by the applicant/petitioner is absolutely unacceptable and is rejected at the first instance.

7. The present review application has been filed by a changed counsel. The counsel appearing in the review application is not the same counsel, who appeared in the writ petition when the order dated 19.07.2024



**CM-5248 & 5249-CWP-2026 in  
RA-CW-172-2026 in  
CWP-18458-2018**

**-4-**

was passed. Therefore, now by changing the counsel, the applicant cannot turn around and say that since certain documents were not within his knowledge and possession at the time of passing of the aforesaid order, the order dated 19.07.2024 may be reviewed.

8. This Court is of the considered view that filing of the present review application and that too with a delay of 571 days, is purely an abuse of the process of law and deserves to be deprecated by this Court. Even otherwise also, no ground is available in the application to condone the delay of 571 days in filing the present review application. Consequently, both the applications are hereby dismissed with costs of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only). The applicant is directed to deposit the aforesaid costs with the High Court Legal Services Committee within a period of three months from today.

9. Put up for compliance regarding the payment of costs after three months.

**16.04.2026**

*Bhumika*

**(JASGURPREET SINGH PURI)  
JUDGE**

|                               |        |
|-------------------------------|--------|
| 1. Whether speaking/reasoned: | Yes/No |
| 2. Whether reportable:        | Yes/No |