



2026:CGHC:3181-DB

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WA No. 38 of 2026

Vinod Kumar S/o Pokla Ram, Aged About 56 Years R/o Village And Post- Korudha, Police Station Kusmi (Samri), District Surguja (C.G.)

... **Appellant**

versus

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through The Secretary, Home (Police) Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

2 - The Director General of Police, Police Headquarter, Sector-19, Atal Nagar, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (C.G.)

3 - The Deputy Inspector General of Police, Chhattisgarh Arms Force, Bhilai, District Durg (C.G.)

4 - The Commandant, 3rd Batttalion, Chhattisgarh Arms Force, Amleshwar, Durg, District Durg (C.G.)

5 - Assistant Commandant, 3rd Battalion, Chhattisgarh Arms Force, Amleshwar, Durg, District Durg (C.G.)

... **Respondents**

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Appellant	:	None
For State/Respondents	:	Mr. Prasun Kumar Bhaduri, Deputy Advocate General

Hon'ble Shri Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

Hon'ble Shri Ravindra Kumar Agrawal, Judge

Judgment on Board

Per Ramesh Sinha, Chief Justice

20.01.2026

1. None appears nor is any representation made on behalf of the appellant to press this appeal on repeated calls. Mr. Prasun



Kumar Bhaduri, learned Deputy Advocate General, appearing on behalf of the State/respondents, is present.

2. The present intra Court appeal has been filed by the appellant against the order dated 14.11.2025 passed by the learned Single Judge in WPS No.12914 of 2025, whereby the learned Single Judge has dismissed of the writ petition filed by the writ petitioner.
3. From perusal of the impugned order and the record annexed therewith, it transpires that the services of the appellant/writ petitioner were terminated vide order dated 31.05.2008. The statutory appeal preferred by the appellant/writ petitioner came to be rejected on 09.04.2009 and the mercy petition was also rejected on 12.04.2010. Thereafter, the appellant/writ petitioner chose to submit successive representations on different dates, which were rejected lastly on 13.06.2023. It is well settled that mere submission of repeated representations does not furnish a fresh or continuing cause of action nor does it extend the limitation for invoking the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.
4. From the material available on record, it is evident that the cause of action had finally arisen in the year 2010 itself when the mercy petition was rejected, yet the present writ petition has been filed after an inordinate delay of about 15 years from the date of termination. Such unexplained and excessive delay clearly attracts the doctrine of delay and laches. The law is no longer res



integra that stale claims, particularly in service matters, ought not to be entertained in writ jurisdiction merely on the ground that no statutory period of limitation is prescribed.

5. In view of the aforesaid facts and the settled legal position, this Court finds no justification to entertain the present writ petition at such a belated stage. Accordingly, the writ petition deserves to be and is hereby dismissed on the ground of delay and laches alone.

Sd/-
(Ravindra Kumar Agrawal)
Judge

Sd/-
(Ramesh Sinha)
Chief Justice