



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CM-20218-CII-2025 in/and
FAO-5767-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.04.2026

Rajwanti and another Appellants
Vs.
Deepak and others . . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE DEEPAK GUPTA

Present: - None.

DEEPAK GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Despite pass over of the matter and even after the grant of last opportunity on the previous date of hearing, none has put in appearance on behalf of the appellants. The matter is, therefore, taken up in their absence.

2. The present appeal is accompanied by an application bearing **CM-20218-CII-2025** seeking condonation of delay of 472 days in filing the appeal against the order dated 01.03.2024 passed by the learned Motor Accident Claims Tribunal, Narnaul.

3. The only ground pleaded in the application for condonation of delay is that, on account of paucity of funds, the appellants were unable to file the appeal within the prescribed period of limitation.

4. Having considered the averments made in the application and perused the record, this Court finds the explanation to be wholly insufficient and devoid of merit.

5. It is a settled principle of law that while the expression "sufficient cause" employed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 is to receive a liberal construction so as to advance substantial justice, such liberality cannot be extended to cover cases of gross negligence, inaction or lack of bona fides. The applicant is required to furnish a plausible and cogent explanation accounting for the entire period of delay. A bald and vague plea, unsupported by material particulars, does not satisfy the test of "sufficient cause".



FAO-5767-2025

6. In the present case, the delay is of 472 days, which is substantial. The explanation offered is merely that of financial constraints. However, no details whatsoever have been furnished as to the nature of such constraints, the period during which the appellants remained incapacitated, or the steps taken by them to arrange resources for pursuing the remedy. The plea, thus, remains a general and unsubstantiated assertion.

7. Further, the record reveals that the appellants were duly represented by counsel before the learned Tribunal. This fact negates the contention that they were completely incapacitated from pursuing legal remedies. Even otherwise, if there was genuine financial hardship, the appellants could have availed recourse to legal aid mechanisms available through the Legal Services Authorities constituted under the Legal Services Authorities Act, 1987. There is nothing on record to indicate that any such effort was made.

8. The conduct of the appellants, therefore, reflects lack of due diligence and absence of bona fide intention to prosecute the appeal within time. The law of limitation, though procedural, is founded on sound public policy to ensure finality and certainty in litigation. Courts cannot condone inordinate delay in a routine or mechanical manner, particularly when no sufficient cause is made out.

9. In view of the above, this Court is of the considered opinion that the appellants have failed to demonstrate any “sufficient cause” for condonation of the inordinate delay of 472 days.

10. Consequently, the application bearing CM-20218-CII-2025 for condonation of delay is dismissed. As a necessary corollary, the appeal bearing FAO-5767-2025, being barred by limitation, is also dismissed.

(DEEPAK GUPTA)
JUDGE

22.04.2026

Vivek

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>No</i>