

THE COURT OF SESSIONS JUDGE, AYODHYA

Criminal Misc. Case No.53 of 2026

[CNR No.: UPFZ010020782026]

MMTC-PAMP Pvt. Ltd.

Versus

State of U.P. & another

11.06.2026

1. Put up today. Learned counsels for the parties are present.
2. 5B application accompanied with affidavit 6B has been moved by the revisionist/applicant U/s 5 of Limitation Act to condone the delay in filing the criminal revision against the impugned order dated 09.01.2026 passed by Court below in Crl. Misc. Case No.1811/2025 State Vs. Rakesh Kumar, Crime No.457/2025, U/s 318(4) BNS & 66C I.T. Act, P.S. Kotwali Rudauli, District Ayodhya. It has been stated that due to the unresponsive behaviour of previous counsel, revision could not be filed within prescribed period. The delay has been caused inadvertently not in deliberately. Hence, the delay should be condoned in the interest of justice.
3. Learned counsels of opposite parties orally opposed the application.
4. Heard learned counsels and perused the records.
5. As per the Office report, there is delay of only three days in filing the revision. The settled legal position is that the expression 'sufficient cause' in Section 5 of Limitation Act, must receive a liberal construction so as to advance substantial justice and generally delays in cases, are required to be condoned in interest of justice, where no gross negligence or deliberate inaction or lack of bonafides is imputable to the party seeking condonation of the delay. Thus, in the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, considering the period of delay, in the interest of justice, it is proper and sufficient to condone the alleged delay in filing the revision.
6. Hence, application 5B moved U/s 5 of Limitation Act, is allowed. The delay in filing the revision is hereby condoned.
7. Accordingly, the Misc. Case is disposed off.
8. The file be put up after lunch for hearing on admission.

Dated: 11.06.2026

(Rananjay Kumar Verma)
Sessions Judge
Ayodhya