



\$~25

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 3839/2025**
PAPPU RAM JATPetitioner

Through: Mr. Ramniwas Bansal, Adv.
versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Farman Ali CGSC with
Ms. Usha Jamnal & Ms. Tanya,
Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **20.05.2026**

1. The present petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India assailing order dated 11.10.2021 passed by the Competent Authority and inter office note dated 27.12.2021.
2. Undisputedly, the Petitioner's request for converting his Extraordinary Leave into work related illness and injury leave under Rule 44 of the CCS (Leave) Rules was rejected on 27.12.2021.
3. The Petitioner, thereafter, submitted certain representations before the competent authority. It is further undisputed that the Petitioner filed the present Writ Petition only in the year 2025.
4. It is pertinent to note that if the Petitioner was to file a civil suit, the limitation would be from the date of order, that is, 27.12.2021 and would run for a period of three years.
5. This petition has been filed much beyond the period of three years and no valid reasons have been given by the Petitioner to justify the delay.
6. In this regard, we may draw reference to the Judgment of the Supreme Court in **Chennai Metropolitan Water Supply & Sewerage Board v. T.T. Murali Babu : (2014) 4 SCC 108**, wherein it was held



as under:-

“16. Thus, the doctrine of delay and laches should not be lightly brushed aside. A writ court is required to weigh the explanation offered and the acceptability of the same. The court should bear in mind that it is exercising an extraordinary and equitable jurisdiction. As a constitutional court it has a duty to protect the rights of the citizens but simultaneously it is to keep itself alive to the primary principle that when an aggrieved person, without adequate reason, approaches the court at his own leisure or pleasure, the court would be under legal obligation to scrutinise whether the lis at a belated stage should be entertained or not. Be it noted, delay comes in the way of equity. In certain circumstances delay and laches may not be fatal but in most circumstances inordinate delay would only invite disaster for the litigant who knocks at the doors of the court. Delay reflects inactivity and inaction on the part of a litigant — a litigant who has forgotten the basic norms, namely, “procrastination is the greatest thief of time” and second, law does not permit one to sleep and rise like a phoenix. Delay does bring in hazard and causes injury to the lis.”

7. From the foregoing, it is evident that while no statutory limitation period is prescribed for instituting a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, undue delay and laches may nonetheless defeat the petitioners’ right to challenge the impugned order, as it could cause prejudice to the opposite party.

8. It is also well settled that repeated representations to the Competent Authority do not extend the period of limitation.

9. Thus, this Court finds no reason to entertain the present petition and the same is dismissed solely on the ground of delay and laches.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MAY 20, 2026
“SS”