NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD
R/CIVIL APPLICATION (FOR CONDONATION OF DELAY) NO. 1690 of 2025

In F/FIRST APPEAL/6265/2025

With

R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1692 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6273 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1693 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6401 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1715 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6267 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1720 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6430 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1731 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6406 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1746 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6396 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1747 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6393 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1751 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6410 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1753 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6390 of 2025
With
R/CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 1754 of 2025
In
F/FIRST APPEAL NO. 6269 of 2025

FOR APPROVAL AND SIGNATURE:

HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ILESH J. VORA Sd/-

and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R. T. VACHHANI Sd/-

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

==========

Approved for Reporting	Yes	No
	✔	

==========

STATE OF GUJARAT
Versus
JIVRAJ GOVINDBHAI & ORS.

==========

Appearance:
MR BHAVESH DESAI, AGP for the Applicant(s) No. 1
MR BM MANGUKIYA(437) for the Respondent(s) No. 1,2,3
MS BELA A PRAJAPATI(1946) for the Respondent(s) No. 1
MR HARDIK MUCHHALA for the Respondent No.1 in CA 1692/2025
MR YAGNESHKUMAR JOSHI for the Respondent in CA 1731/2025, 1747/2025 & 1751/2025

==========

CORAM: **HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ILESH J. VORA**
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE R. T. VACHHANI

Date : 03/08/2026

COMMON ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER : HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ILESH J. VORA)

1. This order will dispose of all the applications, which were heard together on account of common legal issue raised therein.

2. The captioned applications are being filed by the State Government and its Department – Deputy Executive Engineer, R & B Division, Rajkot, seeking condonation of delay in filing the first appeals. The first appeals are directed against the judgment and award passed by the Reference Court in land acquisition proceedings. In all applications, there is a delay of 1790 days i.e. more than five years. The award rendered by the Land Reference Court was on 30.12.2019 and first appeals along with the delay condonation applications were presented before this Court on 19.02.2025.

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

3. The brief facts giving rise to file present applications for condonation of delay are stated to be as under:

(1) The lands of respondents – owners situated at village: Paddhari, Dist.: Rajkot were acquired for making four lane road known as Rajkot – Jamnagar State Highway.

(2) Notification under Section 4 was issued on 28.02.2008.

(3) On 08.05.2008 declaration made under Section 6 of the L.A. Act.

(4) Thereafter, the Special Land Acquisition Officer, Rajkot passed an Award (LAQ No. 5 of 2008 dated 01.09.2009) fixing the price Rs.26.50ps per sq.mt for agriculture land and Rs.229.75ps per sq.mt. for non-agriculture land.

(5) The land owners sought Reference under Section 18 of the L.A. Act.

(6) The Reference Court in a group of Land Reference Cases as referred above, enhanced the price for the non-agriculture land to Rs.7107/- per sq.mt and Rs.5109/- per sq.mt for agriculture land along with the statutory benefits and interest.

4. In such circumstances, the captioned applications filed seeking condonation of delay in filing First Appeals.

5. The grounds of delay are explained as under:

(1) The acquiring body, R & B Department, Rajkot was informed on 15.02.2022 by the counsel appearing of the land owners that the impugned award dated 31.12.2019 came to be passed by the Land Reference Court.

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

(2) Vide its letters dated 25.02.2022 and 12.04.2022, the office of the Deputy Executive Engineer, Rajkot sought an opinion from the Incharge Assistant Government Pleader of the case.

(3) Vide its letter dated 12.05.2022, the office of the Deputy Executive Engineer sought an opinion of the Special Land Acquisition Officer.

(4) Vide communication dated 24.05.2022, the Special Land Acquisition Officer sought a copy of the judgment from the R & B Office, Rajkot and the same was provided on 07.06.2022 and thereafter, on 13.06.2022, the Special Land Acquisition Officer gave his opinion to prefer an appeal against the award impugned.

(5) Vide communications dated 06.08.2022, and 30.08.2022, the Higher Authority of R & B Rajkot i.e. Executive Engineer and Superintendent Engineer were intimated about the factual aspect of the case and other things for filing the appeal.

(6) Vide communications dated 23.02.2023, 21.03.2023 and 05.04.2023, the sanction sought from the State Government for filing the appeal and in pursuant to the sanction, the Special Land Acquisition Officer was informed to provide further reasons for filing appeal (05.04.2023) and accordingly, on 25.05.2023, he had provided reasons as sought by the R & B Office.

(7) The further time was consumed in taking final decision of the appeal and it was from 25.05.2023 to 07.07.2023 and thereafter, the Circle Officer, R & B, vide communication dated

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

20.07.2023, had directed to prepare a proposal for filing the appeal.

(8) Vide communications dated 01.08.2023, 17.08.2023, 22.08.2023, 08.02.2024, 17.06.2024, 03.07.2024, 01.08.2024, 17.08.2024, 20.11.2024 and 18.02.2025, the time was consumed in preparing draft, getting sanction from the legal department for filing the appeal, and other things like arrangement of Court's fees, sought sanction to deposit the awarded amount, etc.

(9) Lastly, on 19.02.2025, the office of the Government Law Officer, High Court of Gujarat, filed the First Appeals along with the applications for condonation of delay.

6. Pursuant to the order passed by this Court, the In-charge AGP of the case Mr. Mahesh Joshi filed an affidavit explaining steps taken by him after the judgment and award dated 30.12.2019. In his affidavit, he made the following explanation:

(1) That the concerned department i.e. Deputy Executive Engineer, Road and Building, Sub Division, Rajkot was not made a party to the proceedings and therefore, due to inadvertent error, the office of the R & B Rajkot could not be informed about the passing of the award.

(2) By placing reliance on the order of the Supreme Court, it was explained that due to COVID-19 Pandemic Situation, the period of limitation commencing from 15.03.2020 to 28.02.2022 required to be excluded and fresh limitation period of 90 days from 01.03.2022 required to be computed to ascertain the actual days of

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

delay.

(3) The delay is not deliberate or intentional and partly attributable to the *force majeure* due to COVID-19 Pandemic and partly due to factual circumstances explained herein including failure in intimating the concerned department.

7. Learned AGP Mr. Bhavesh Desai, in addition to the grounds mentioned in the application, contends that; there was a delay in applying the certified copy of the judgment and communicating the same to the concerned department and there was a further delay in seeking opinion of the concerned department and thereafter, since 2022, there was impact of COVID-19 Pandemic and officers of the State Government were also involved in the emergency duties, as a result, neither the acquiring body nor the Special Acquisition Officer could initiate the process promptly. In addition to that, he contends that the appellant has good case on merits and having regard to the amount awarded by the Land Reference Court, the impact on the public exchequer would be large and in that view of the matter, the State or its instrumentalities representing a collective cause should be reconsidered; that, the adoption of strict standard of proof in respect of State and its instrumentalities, where no one takes personal responsibility in processing the matter expeditiously, would lead to grave miscarriage and therefore, by adopting a pragmatic approach, delay may be condoned and in the facts of the present case, the delay was not tainted with malafides and deliberate inaction.

8. To butters the contentions, the heavy reliance being placed on the case of (i) ***University of Delhi Vs. Union of India (2020 (13) SCC 745)***, to contend that impersonal nature of the State's functioning should be

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

given due regard, while ensuring that individual defaults are not nitpicked at the cost of collective interest. (ii) ***State of Nagaland vs. Lipok, AO (2005 3 SCC 752),*** wherein the Supreme Court acknowledged the bureaucratic realities that often account for delay in Government decision making as the Government actions are "conducted by officers who cannot act on their own, but must obtain approvals at different levels" and thus, the element of delay is almost "inbuilt in the Governmental decision making process and accordingly, the Supreme Court held that, factors which are peculiar and characteristic of functioning of the Governmental conditions requires adoption of pragmatic and justice oriented approach by the Courts in matters pertaining to condonation of delay.

9. In such circumstances, Mr. Desai would contend that the explanation offered for condonation of delay is convincing and satisfactory and having regard to the peculiar facts and circumstances of the present case, the delay attributable in procedure delay and incidental to the very decision making process of the state instrumentalities may be liberally construed the term "sufficient cause" to condone the delay and therefore, it was prayed that, if the appeals filed are thrown out due to lapse of limitation period, then, public interest would suffers and in that view of the matter, the applications may be allowed so as to do substantial justice between the parties.

10. Mr. S.P. Majmudar, learned counsel and Mr. B.M. Mangukiya, learned counsel appearing for different land owners-respondents vehemently opposed the applications and submitted that, the applicant-Government Authorities failed to demonstrate any sufficient cause and the explanations offered are not convincing as to why the applicant could

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

not have filed the appeals within the prescribed period of limitation. The Law Officers as well as the Officers of the R & B Department, Rajkot had not acted with reasonable diligence in pursuing the proceedings and in casual approach, they took five years in filing the appeals against the judgment of Land Reference Court. The grounds mentioned in the applications are nothing but lame excuses and it cannot be believed to be an "explanation" to the satisfaction of the court for condoning the delay. It was the admission on the part of the In-charge Assistant Government Pleader of the land reference cases that, inadvertently, he could not inform the concerned party about the passing of the award and also he did not apply for certified copy of the judgment. Even after the COVID-19 Pandemic, the applicant-State, without any reason, did not acted promptly and had consumed three years thereafter in filing the appeals. The offices of R & B were housing in the Rajkot City itself. Despite of this, they took 3 to 4 years for inter department sanctions to file the appeals. Thus, before the Court of Law, the statutory bodies and private bodies stand on the same footing and law is equally applicable to both. The delay is an inordinate delay and in the facts of the present case, the grounds referred in the applications for delay, are not sufficiently explained and having regard to the conduct of the officers, they remained negligent throughout the decision making process and therefore, the delay is attributable to serious latches and negligence on the part of the applicant-State and therefore, no premium can be given to the lethargic and negligent approach on the part of the officers of the applicant and therefore, the delay may not be allowed as a matter of course by accepting the plea that, dismissal of the matter on the ground of bar of limitation will cause injury to the public interest.

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

11. In support of their contentions, the following case laws having been relied:

(i) ***Maniben Devraj shah* vs. *Municipal Corporation, Mumbai (2012 (5) SCC 157)***

(ii) Municipal Corporation of Ahmedabad vs. Voltas Limited (AIR 1995 Gujarat 29)

(iii) Post Master General & Ors. Vs. Living Media India Limited (2012 (3) SCC 563)

(iv) Shivamma (Dead) by Lrs. Vs. Karnataka Housing Board (2025 INSC 1104)

(v) Pathapati Subbareddy (Died) by Lrs. Vs. Special Deputy Collector (2024 (12) SCC 336)

In such circumstances, it was submitted that, no case is made out for condoning the delay in preferring the appeals against the award of the Reference Court and thus, the applications may not be entertained.

12. We have considered the rival submissions advanced by learned counsel appearing for the respective parties and perused the case records as well as affidavits, affidavit-in-reply filed by the parties.

13. In the facts of the present case, the captioned applications are being filed by the State Government, seeking condonation of delay in filing first appeals. The delay is of 1790 days, as the judgment impugned delivered on 31.12.2019 and appeals along with present applications filed on 19.02.2025. In such circumstances, the issue falls for our determination as to whether “sufficient cause” exists for condoning the delay in filing the

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

first appeals?

14. All the applications are filed under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, 1963 which says that, any appeal or any application, may be admitted after the prescribed period, if the appellant or the applicant satisfies the Court that he had sufficient cause for not preferring the appeal or making the application within such period. The term "sufficient cause" has not been defined in the Limitation Act, nor, provide any guidance on what it constituent elements ought to be. Instead, Section 5 leaves the task of determining appropriate reasons for seeking condonation of delay to judicial interpretation and exercise of discretion upon the facts and individual circumstances of each case.

Recently, the Supreme Court, in the case of ***Shivamma (Dead) by Lrs. Vs. Karnataka Housing Board (2025 INSC 1104),*** after referring the earlier all its judgment on the subject "sufficient cause", held and observed as follows:

> *"that, the phrase "sufficient cause" is an expression of elastic import, incapable of precise definition, yet not without boundaries. Its purpose is to empower courts to advance the cause of justice by preventing genuine litigants from being shut out on account of unavoidable delays. At the same time, it is equally clear that the phrase is not charter for indolence or a device to revive stale claims that the law of limitation otherwise extinguishes. The Supreme Court has further observed that, the burden to establish the sufficient cause lies upon the parties seeking condonation and court must be satisfied that the cause is real, Bonafide and free of negligence. The sufficiency of the cause is to be determined contextually, on the totality of circumstances, with due regard to the*

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

conduct of the applicant and the prejudice caused to the opposite parties. The courts must not condone gross negligence, deliberate inaction or casual indifference. The expression "sufficient cause" must be construed in a manner that advances substantial justice while preserving the discipline of limitation. The courts are not to be swayed by sympathy or technical rigidity but rather by judicious appraisal of whether the applicant acted with reasonable diligence in pursuing the remedy. Where the explanation is bona fide, plausible and consistent with ordinary human conduct, courts have leaned towards condonation. Where the negligence, want of good faith or casual approach is discernible, condonation has been refused. The Supreme Court further on the subject "length of delay" held and observed that, the length of delay is immaterial and what matter is acceptability of explanation as the decisive factor is the adequacy of the cause shown, not the length of delay. What is critical is whether the party seeking condonation acted with reasonable diligence during the prescribed period and whether the reasons advanced demonstrate a genuine inability to file within time."

15. In the present case at hand, the applicant-State and its instrumentalities (Road & Building Department, Rajkot) intend to challenge the judgment and award of the Reference Court. One of the contentions of the State raised is that, owing to the peculiar nature of their functioning should be given due regard, as the State represents the collective cause of the public, any delay on its part ought not to be viewed through the same lens as that of private party. A strict standard of proof in respect of State or its instrumentalities, where no one takes personal responsibility in processing the matters expeditiously would lead to grave miscarriage of public justice and thus, by adopting pragmatic approach, the delay without insisting upon explaining every day's delay

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

may require to be condoned **(*Special Tehsildar, Land Acquisition vs. K.V. Ayisumma (1996 10 SCC 634)*, *State of Haryana vs. Chandramani (1996 3 SCC 132)*, *State of Nagaland vs. Lipok AO. (2005 3 SCC 752)*, *Sheo Raj Singh vs. Union of India (2023 10 SCC 531)*, *Manipur vs. Koting Lamkang (2019 10 SCC 408)*, *University of Delhi vs. Union of India (2020 13 SCC 745)*.**

16. We may profitably refer the observations made by the Supreme Court in the case of ***Shivamma (Dead) (supra)***, more particularly paragraph-210 to 216. In the said paragraphs, the Supreme Court after referring the judgments of ***Postmaster General vs. Living Media India Limited (2012 3 SCC 563)***, ***Lanka Venkateswarlu vs. State of A.P. (Manu SC 0153-2011)***, ***State of U.P. vs. Amarnath Yadav (2014 2 SCC 422)***, ***State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Bherulal (2020 10 SCC 654)***, ***University of Delhi vs. Union of India (2020 13 SCC 745)***, ***Government of Maharashtra (Water Resources Department) vs. Borse Brothers Engineers & Contractors Private Limited (2021 6 SCC 460)***, ***State of Odissa vs. Sunanda Mahakuda (2021 11 SCC 560)***, ***State of U.P. Vs. Sabha Narain (2022 9 SCC 266)*** *and* ***Union of India vs. Byramji Jeejeebhoy (2024 INSC 262)***, held and observed thus:

> "*What may be discerned from the aforesaid is that, the jurisprudence on condonation of delay under Section 5 of the Limitation Act, particularly where the State or any of its instrumentalities is involved, has witnessed a significant shift. From a regime that once accorded preferential indulgence to the State, premised on its bureaucratic complexities and institutional inertia, the law has now evolved to insist upon the parity between the Government and the private litigants. The rational is that, the public interest is better served not by excusing Governmental*

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

inefficiency, but by fostering accountability, diligence and responsibility in the conduct of public litigation. No litigant, be it a private party or State, or any of its functionaries is entitled to a broader margin of error, falling in the category of inaction, negligence or casualness in the matters of limitation. Governmental litigants, no less than private parties must demonstrate bonafide, sufficient and cogent cause for delay. What has been conveyed in so many words, by the decision of Postmaster General (supra), is that while excuses premised solely on bureaucratic lethargy cannot, by themselves constitute sufficient cause, there may be nonetheless be circumstances where the explanation offered, though involving bureaucratic procedures, reflects a genuine and bonafide cause for the delay. In such instances the true test is whether the explanation demonstrates that the State acted with reasonable diligence, and whether the delay occurred despite efforts to act within time. Where such bonafides are established, the court retains the discretion to condone the delay. In other words, Postmaster General (supra) does not shut the door on the condonation of delay by the State in all cases involving bureaucratic processes. The real distinction lies between a case where the delay is the result of gross negligence, inaction or casual indifference on the part of the State and a case where delay has occurred despite sincere efforts owing to the inherent complexities of the Governmental decision making. While the former category must necessarily be rejected to uphold the discipline of limitation, the later can still attract judicial indulgence where public interest is at stake and the cause is shown to be reasonable. In this regard, the vital test that has to be employed, wherever sufficient cause is sought to be demonstrated on the ground of bureaucratic inefficiencies is to distinguish between whether the same is an "explanation" or an "excuse".

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

17. The material on record as well as the explanation offered, is examined in the light of the aforestated preposition of law. The explanation put forth by the applicant-State Authority does not appear to be credible and bonafide. It is on record that, there was negligence, inaction on the part of the concerned officer of the R & B Department, Rajkot Division. The manner in which under the guise of decision making process, the matter was processed would indicative of the fact that, the delay is the result of gross negligence, inaction on the part of the officer concerned.

The reasons for our aforesaid findings are as follows:

(i) The Land Reference Court, Rajkot had disposed of the group of land acquisition matters on 31.12.2019; the in-charge AGP of the case, did not have care to apply for certified copy of the impugned judgment and award of the Land Reference Court, nor, informed to the Special Land Acquisition Officer; the Law Officer failed to follow the Rule-51 and 52 of The Law Officers (Appointment and Conditions of Service) and the Conduct of Legal Affairs of the Government Rules, 2009; Rule-51 says that, as soon as suit is decided, the concerned Government Pleader shall communicate the nature of the decision to Government and to the Collector or other officers concerned, giving in important cases a brief statement of the grounds on which the decision is based; Rule-52 mandates that, the AGP shall then obtain with little delay certified copies of the judgment

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

and decree and same shall be forwarded immediately to the Collector and other officers concerned and others including the Legal Department, Gandhinagar; Rule-53 further caste duty on the AGP to submit his opinion as to whether the decision should be accepted or appealed against; the explanation by the AGP in the present case is contrary to the Rules as referred above; he was very well aware that the acquiring body was R & B Division, Rajkot; Despite of this, he did not apply for certified copies and never intimated to anyone about passing of the judgment and decree which shows the inaction on the part of concerned officer;

(ii) In the present case, the land owners vide their letter dated 15.02.2022, informed the Deputy Executive Engineer, Rajkot about passing of the judgment and asked to deposit the awarded amount. The Higher Office of the Deputy Executive Engineer is housing in Rajkot City i.e. Executive Engineer, Superintendent Engineer were working in Rajkot City itself. Despite of this, from 17.02.2022 to 21.03.2023, the office of R & B through its officers, entered into unnecessary communications and by raising non-material queries and on technicalities, they did not take steps to file appeal expeditiously. The office of R & B got sanction from the Government in the month of March-2023, thereafter also, up to 22.08.2023, no steps were being taken to pursue the proceedings. Even after the sanction from the Legal Department (23.08.2023), the appeals had not been filed till 19.02.2025; the papers were available. The necessary offices

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

of R & B were working in Rajkot itself. The R & B Office was knowing about the pendency of the land acquisition cases. The ground of COVID-19 Pandemic would not come to rescue to the applicant as even during the period of COVID-19, they made inter se communications to the offices and in this modern technology world, everything is possible in a quick manner. Even after COVID-19 period, i.e. from 28.02.2022 to 19.02.2025 i.e. the date of filing of the appeals, the State and its instrumentalities remained inactive which demonstrates their inaction and not acted with due diligence in pursuing the proceedings. Thus, therefore, the explanation, offered, in our opinion, is not satisfactory and convincing and does not fall under the phrase "sufficient cause", as the same is nothing but a lame excuse by the officers concerned to deny responsibility and consequences and it can be said to be a defensive action. Therefore, the explanations as offered in the applications for delay in preferring the appeals would not demonstrate genuineness of the action. On the contrary, it shows gross negligence, lack of bonafides, casualness in conduct of the officers concerned.

18. It is the contention of the applicant-State that, if the delay is not condoned, then, it would lead to grave miscarriage of public justice as the State is represents the collective cause of community and as such there was no malafide. We are not agreed with the said contention. The

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

Supreme Court in the referred judgment (*Shivamma (Dead) (supra),* while dealing with the said issue, has answered and explained that whatever the strong case on merits, is no ground for condonation of delay and the court concerned has to inquire as to whether sufficient cause has been demonstrated for filing the appeal within prescribed period of limitation and in the process of that inquiry, the merits of the case are wholly extraneous to this inquiry. If the courts were to look into the merits of the matter at the stage of inquiry, it would blurr the boundaries between preliminary procedural question and substantive adjudication thereby conflating two distinct stages of judicial scrutiny. The purpose of Section 5 of Limitation Act is not to determine whether the claim is legally or factually strong, but only whether the applicant had a reasonable justification for the delay. In the facts of present case, as discussed above, except *inter se* communications, nothing on record to justify the delay caused in preferring the appeals. The officer concerned could have used modern technologies i.e. *inter se* communications could be possible by e-mail and through messenger, more particularly all the offices located in the Rajkot City itself. On perusal of the *inter se* communications, it is evident that, the unnecessary queries were raised, despite of opinion of the concerned officers, the repeated opinions were being called for which fact demonstrates that, the office of Deputy Executive Engineer, Executive Engineer, Superintendent Engineer and other officers of Rajkot R & B Division including the Law Officers were not acted with reasonable diligence in pursuing the remedy and the explanation in the form of "excuse" are not bonafide, plausible and having regard to the conduct of the officers and the manner in which they took five years in filing delay condonation applications shows negligent

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

act and casual approach on their part.

19. For the reasons aforementioned, in our opinion, the reasons set forth for the delay are totally insufficient to condone the delay and the explanation is no explanation much less sufficient or satisfactory explanation, which can be said to constitute 'sufficient cause' for not preferring the appeals within prescribed time period.

20. Accordingly, the captioned applications failed and are hereby dismissed. We are constrained to observe that, after pronouncement of the judgment and award of the Land Reference Court and during the pendency of the applications, the amount whatever deposited along with the amount of statutory benefits by the State, has already been withdrawn by the land owners. If the steps would have taken promptly, then, this situation of withdrawing the 100% amount could have been avoided. Thus, by pursuing the proceedings by the officers of R & B Department would nothing but wastage of judicial time. We restrained ourselves for imposing cost on wastage of judicial time, however, we direct the Secretary, R & B Department, State of Gujarat to look into the matter and take necessary action to fix the personal liability of the concerned officer who acted negligent in pursuing the remedy so that, in future, such kind of instances can be avoided. In this regard, we may refer the observations made by the Supreme Court in the case of *Shivamma (Dead). (supra)*. In para-210 of the judgment, it was observed that, "the public interest should better served by excusing Governmental inefficiency, but by fostering accountability, diligent and responsibility in the conduct of public litigation."

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026

NEUTRAL CITATION
2026:GUJHC:48580-DB

21. Learned Assistant Government Pleader shall bring to the notice of Secretary, R & B Department about passing of this judgment.

Sd/-

(ILESH J. VORA,J)

Sd/-

(R. T. VACHHANI, J)

TAUSIF SAIYED

Uploaded by () on Downloaded on : Wed Aug 05 07:45:32 IST 2026