



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

129

CWP-18548-2026

Date of Decision: 01.07.2026

UMED KUMAR AND ANOTHER

...Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Radhe Shyam Sharma, Advocate for petitioners

Mr. Priyavrat Parashar, AAG, Haryana

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (ORAL)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India are seeking quashing of order dated 18.12.2025 (Annexure P-6) passed by Executive Engineer, Sirsa whereby their claim for compensation of land has been rejected. They are further seeking direction to pay the due amount of compensation.

2. This is second round of litigation. As per petition, the petitioners claim themselves owners in possession of land situated in Village Nehrana, Tehsil Nathusari Chaupta, District Sirsa. They claim that respondents utilized their land for construction of Sheranwali Distributary without initiating acquisition proceedings and awarding compensation. As per demarcation conducted by revenue authorities vide report dated



10.10.2022 their land measuring 3 Kanals 8 Marlas falls under Sheranwali Distributary. Petitioners approached this Court by way of *CWP-5629-2024* which was disposed of vide order dated 11.03.2024 (Annexure P-4) with a direction to competent authority to consider their claim. Executive Engineer, Sirsa vide order dated 18.12.2025 rejected their claim. They preferred *COCP 4427 of 2025* which was disposed of with liberty to petitioners to challenge the impugned order.

3. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that respondents are changing their stand. They have no right to grab petitioners' land. They are bound to pay compensation in accordance with law.

4. Land of the petitioners, if any, was acquired and utilized in 1955. The respondent has constructed Sheranwali Distributary over land in question.

5. On being asked reason of inordinate delay, learned counsel for petitioners submits that petitioners came to know about their right in 2022 when demarcation of the land took place, thus, petition is maintainable.

6. 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, 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.

7. 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 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.”

8. Land in question was used by respondent in 1955 and petitioners woke up in 2024. There is no explanation for the inordinate delay.



9. In the wake of judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court and considering inordinate delay on the part of petitioner, this Court does not find it appropriate to invoke its extra-ordinary writ jurisdiction. The petition deserves to be dismissed and accordingly dismissed.

10. Pending Misc. application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

01.07.2026
SDK

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