

2025:PHHC:103410



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

SR. NO.122

**CRM-30265-2025 IN/AND
CRR-1901-2025
DATE OF DECISION:06.08.2025**

MOHIT

...PETITIONER(S)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA

...RESPONDENT(S)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE N.S. SHEKHAWAT

Present: Mr. Randeep S. Dhull, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

N.S. SHEKHAWAT, J.

1. The applicant-petitioner has filed the present application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act for condonation of delay of 2719 days in filing the present revision petition.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant-petitioner submits that the petitioner belongs to a poor family and due to paucity of funds, he could not file the revision petition before this Court within the stipulated time period. Even he was misinformed by his counsel that his appeal had already been dismissed and only at the last stage of his sentence, he could apply for premature release only. However, when he applied for premature release before the concerned jail authorities, he came to know that he had the remedy of challenging the impugned judgment before this Court by way of

a revision petition also. Learned counsel next submits that the delay of 2719 days had occurred due to aforementioned reasons.

3. Notice of the application.

4. On the asking of Court, Mr. Rajinder Kumar Banku, Sr. DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

5. I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

6. In fact the present revision petition has been filed before this Court against the impugned judgment dated 20.11.2017 passed by the court of Additional Sessions Judge, Kurukshetra, whereby the appeal filed by the present petitioner was ordered to be dismissed. Even the petitioner was represented by a counsel before the trial Court as well as before the first appellate court. Consequently, it can never be said that the petitioner did not have any legal advise before both the courts below. Moreover, the petitioner could have filed the present revision petition through a counsel, which is provided to the poor litigants by the State Legal Services Authority. However, no such steps were taken by the petitioner in time and now the revision petition has been filed after a delay of more than 7 ½ years.

In view of the above, the present revision petition is hopelessly time barred and accordingly, the application for condonation of delay as well as the main petition are dismissed.

**(N.S. SHEKHAWAT)
JUDGE**

06.08.2025
mks

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: YES / NO
Whether Reportable: YES / NO