

103 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-2713-2022(O&M)
Date of Decision: 11.03.2026

Ranjit Singh @ Neeta ...Petitioner
vs.
Joginder Singh ...Respondent

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice N.S.Shekhawat

Present : Mr. Rohan Garg, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Gaurav Datta, Advocate with
Mr. Abhishek Sharma, Advocate, for the respondent.

Mr.M.S.Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

N.S.Shekhawat J. (Oral)

CRM-47360-2022

1. The petitioner has filed the present application under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. read with Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of delay of 102 days in filing the present revision petition before this Court.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has vehemently argued that the petitioner is a poor person and was not aware of the correct legal remedy available to him. Apart from that, he was also unable to send the documents pertaining to the present petition to learned counsel on time and due to this, the delay of 102 days has occurred in filing the present revision petition before this Court.

3. On the other hand, learned counsel for the respondent has argued that the petitioner is a well educated person and belongs to an affluent family. Apart from that, it is also apparent from the impugned order that he was represented by a learned counsel before the trial Court and it cannot be said that he was not aware of the correct legal remedy available to him.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record carefully.

5. In the present case, the impugned order was passed by the trial Court on 27.05.2022. After passing of the impugned order, for almost 6 months, the petitioner did not even apply for certified copy of the impugned order before the trial Court. He applied for the certified copy of the impugned order on 09.12.2022 and thereafter, the present revision petition was filed before this Court. Even he was duly represented by Shri. R.K.Arora, Advocate before the trial Court and it cannot be said that he was not aware of the correct legal remedy available to him. In fact, when a party is represented by a learned counsel, it is presumed that he was aware of the proper legal remedies available to him. Still further, the averments made in the application for condonation of delay are completely vague and unfounded.

6. Thus, finding no merits, the present application is ordered to be dismissed.

CRR-2713-2022(O&M)

1. Since the present revision petition is found to be hopelessly time barred, there is no need to pass any order in the main petition.

2. The present revision petition is ordered to be dismissed.

3. Pending applications, if any, stand also disposed of.

11.03.2026
hemlata

(N.S.SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE

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