



2026:AHC-LKO:8219-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CIVIL MISC REVIEW APPLICATION DEFECTIVE No. - 163 of 2025

Jainendra Pratap Singh

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. Thru. Prin.Secy. P.W.D. Lko.And 3
Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)	:	Som Kartik Shukla
Counsel for Opposite Party(s)	:	

Court No. - 1

**HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.
HON'BLE SUBHASH VIDYARTHI, J.**

**(Order on C.M.Application No.1 of 2025; Application for
Condonation of Delay)**

1. Heard.

2. The judgment review of which has been sought by the applicant is dated 02.01.2023. The application seeking review has been filed on 23.09.2025. In the case at hand the delay is of 965 days' in filing the review application. Even though the Limitation Act, 1963 does not apply *stricto sensu* to the review proceedings seeking review of a judgment passed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India in view of a Single Judge Bench's decision in the case of ***Smt. Mohd. Jahan Begum & Another (M/S 349/2007) vs. Board of Revenue, U.P. Allahabad & Others*** passed in ***Review Petition No.329 of 2010 dated 23.09.2016***, nevertheless, delay is a factor to be taken into consideration and is required to be explained.

3. We have gone through the affidavit in support of the application for condonation of delay explaining the same but we do not find the explanation to be acceptable for such an inordinate delay. The affidavit runs into 12 paragraphs. The only plea taken is of depression and Sciatica pain which kept the applicant bedridden. Some prescriptions have also been filed. We are not ready to accept that the aforesaid ailments were of

such a nature and continued so long that the applicant could not file an application seeking review within a reasonable time after passing of the judgment referred hereinabove. The last prescription is of 31.07.2025. Even if the aforesaid prescriptions are accepted, the point is what is the explanation for the period after 31.07.2025 till filing of the review application, none.

4. In view of the aforesaid, we are not satisfied with the explanations offered for such an inordinate delay, accordingly, we see no reason to entertain this review application. The application for condonation of delay is **rejected**, consequently, the review application also stands rejected.

(Subhash Vidyarthi,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

February 3, 2026

-Piyush-