



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

101

Date of decision: 09.07.2025

CWP-5258-2025 (O&amp;M)

CWP-5282-2025 (O&amp;M)

M/s GK Housing &amp; Developers Private Ltd. vs. State of Punjab and others

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY**

Present: Mr. Sandeep Verma, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Manipal Singh Atwal, DAG, Punjab.

\*\*\*

**AMAN CHAUDHARY, J. (Oral)**

1. Prayer made in the present petition for quashing the orders dated 04.01.2024, 17.07.2024 and 18.09.2024 (Annexures P4 to P6, respectively).

2. Learned counsel submits that the petitioner had filed an appeal challenging the order, along with application for condonation of delay of 4 months, however, the Appellate Authority has rejected the same merely on the ground of it being time barred without referring to the same or dealing with the merits of the case, review whereof was also dismissed on account of its non-maintainability.

3. A worthwhile reference can be made to **Postmaster General vs. Living Media India Ltd.**, (2012) 3 SCC 563, wherein Hon'ble the Supreme Court observed that, "Though we are conscious of the fact that in a matter of condonation of delay when there was no gross negligence or deliberate inaction or lack of bona fides, a liberal concession has to be adopted to advance substantial justice..."

4. In **Mahadeo Vithoba Nikam vs. Gajanan Pandurang Kulkarni**, (1998) 9 SCC 716, the appeal was allowed setting aside all the orders of the appellate and revisional authority as also the High Court and the matter was remanded for fresh decision on merits after hearing the parties and observed that even though the appellant was not present before the Additional Tehsildar and filed the appeal against the order after a significant delay, the Appellate Authority was to consider the same on merits but it had been dismissed solely on the basis of delay.

5. The Appellate Authority in the case of **Arvind Gupta vs. Assistant Commissioner of Revenue State Taxes** WPA-2904-2023 dated 04.01.2024, had rejected the appeal on the ground of there being no provision under the GST Act for condoning the delay beyond four months, which was set aside by the High Court and it was directed to decide the same on merits.

6. It was incumbent upon the Appellate Authority to have, at the least considered the reasons, projected that caused the delay and examined the sufficiency thereof, likewise was it imperative for it to view the merits of the appeal, rather than axing it on account of delay alone, notably it being a substantive right. Even for this Court to have a holistic view, it would have been better that there was an application of mind by an authority higher than the one which was appealed against, reflected through an order. Moreso, the petitioner would stand to gain nothing by delaying filing it.

7. It is trite that the cause of justice deserves to be preferred, when pitted against technical considerations. As such, a pragmatic approach instead of pedantic must be adopted.

8. Keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, the impugned orders dated 17.07.2024 and 18.09.2024 (Annexures P5 & P6, respectively) are set aside. The matter is remitted to the Appellate Authority, for deciding it afresh, in accordance with law, within a period of four months, granting to the petitioner an opportunity of hearing.

9. The present petition is disposed of accordingly.

10. Photocopy of this order be placed on the connected file.

( AMAN CHAUDHARY )  
JUDGE

09.07.2025

ashok

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