

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI

W.P.(S). No. 828 of 2018

Chandru Oraon, aged about 50 years, s/o. late Jawna Oraon, resident of Shastri Nagar, Hariom Colony, P.O. Gumla, P.O. Gumla, District Gumla, Jharkhand, Pin:-835207. **Petitioner**

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Secretary, Department of Revenue, Registration and Land Reform, Government of Jharkhand, Project Bhawan, H.E.C. Township, P.O. & P.S. Dhurva, District Ranchi, Jharkhand.
3. The Divisional Commissioner, South Chotanagpur Division, District Ranchi, Jharkhand.
4. The District Magistrate, P.O. Gumla, P.S. Gumla, District Gumla, Jharkhand.
5. The SDM/SDO, P.O. Basiya, P.S. Basiya, District Gumla, Jharkhand.

..... **Respondents**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK ROSHAN

For the Petitioner : Mr. Abhishek Kr. Gupta, Advocate
For the Respondents : Mr. Mithilesh Singh, GA-IV
Mr. Bhanu Pratap, AC to GA-IV

07/ 28.01.2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The instant application has been preferred by the petitioner for quashing the order dated 05.05.2001, issued by respondent No. 4, whereby punishment of withholding of four increments with cumulative effect has been awarded and further, it has been ordered that no promotion will be given to the petitioner in future and he will not be entitled for any other allowance, save and except, the subsistence allowance for the period of suspension.

Petitioner has further prayed for quashing the order passed by the appellate authority dated 20.09.2011 and after quashing the aforesaid orders, the respondents be directed to grant all consequential benefits to the petitioner.

3. From the records it appears that the order of punishment is dated 05.05.2001. Thereafter, the petitioner slept over the matter and after a gap of 10 years, he filed an appeal before the appellate

authority which was also dismissed on 20.09.2011. Thereafter, the petitioner again did not choose to challenge the appellate order, inasmuch as, the instant writ application has been filed on 16.02.2018.

4. Apart from the merit, learned counsel for the petitioner tries to impress upon this Court that in writ jurisdiction there is no limitation.
5. However, the issue of delay and laches on behalf of the litigant has been dealt elaborately in the case of *State of Kerala & Ors. Vs. A.K. Gopakumar*¹. For brevity, para-9 of that case is extracted herein below:

“9. It is also apposite to note that the writ petition filed by the respondent on 15-3-2010 was highly belated and the High Court would have been fully justified in refusing to entertain the respondent’s prayer because he had not offered any explanation for the time gap of 2 years and 8 months between the issue of order of dismissal and filing of the writ petition.”

6. In the instant case also, the petitioner has not explained the delay. Moreover, the delay is not short; rather, the petitioner slept over the matter for years together. No specific averment has been given on the ground of delay and laches.
7. Having regard to the aforesaid discussions, no relief can be granted. Accordingly, the instant writ application stands dismissed.

(Deepak Roshan, J.)

28th January, 2026

Kunal/-

Uploaded on 03/02/2026

¹ (2013) 11 SCC 606