



2026:AHC-LKO:11021-DB

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD
LUCKNOW**

CIVIL MISC REVIEW APPLICATION DEFECTIVE No. - 153 of 2022

State Of U.P. Thru. Addl. Chief Secy. Deptt. Social
Welfare Govt. Of U.P. Civil Sectr. Lko. And Ors

.....Applicant(s)

Versus

Anirudh Prakash Pandey And Others

.....Opposite
Party(s)

Counsel for Applicant(s)

: C.S.C.

Counsel for Opposite Party(s)

:

Court No. - 1

HON'BLE RAJAN ROY, J.

HON'BLE ABDHESH KUMAR CHAUDHARY, J.

**(Order on C.M.Application No.1/2022; Application for Condonation
of Delay)**

1. Heard.

2. This is an application for condonation of delay in filing the review application seeking review of the order dated 18.12.2019 which has also been passed on a Review Petition No.118058 of 2017 albeit at the behest of another party and not the State. The application seeking review has been filed with a delay of more than 306 days after passing of the said order dated 18.12.2019. The order refers to the presence of the Standing Counsel and query put to him, therefore, the applicant-State cannot say that they were not aware of the said order as they were duly represented by the Standing Counsel.

3. At this stage, Dr. L.P. Mishra, learned Counsel appearing for the respondents says that ***Special Leave to Appeal (C) bearing No. 10327 of 2022; State of U.P. and Others vs. Anirudh Prakash Pandey & Others*** against the order dated 18.12.2019, review of which has been sought by the State, has already been dismissed on 25.07.2022. He also says that a similar review filed by the State seeking review of the same order dated 18.12.2019, review of which has been sought, has already been dismissed bearing Civil Misc. Review Application Defective No.152 of 2022,

however, Standing Counsel says that Special Leave to Appeal has been filed against the said judgment dated 05.01.2023 passed in Civil Misc. Review Application Defective No.152 of 2022 which is pending.

4. Be that as it may, we are not concerned with the merit of the issues involved and are only on the question of delay.

5. We have gone through the affidavit in support of the application for condonation of delay in filing this application seeking review and do not find the explanation therein to be satisfactory and sufficient for explaining such inordinate delay of 306 days' when tested on the anvil of the recent decision of Hon'ble the Supreme Court rendered in the case of ***Shivamma (Dead) by LRS vs. Karnatka Housing Board and another*** reported in ***2025 SCC OnLine 1969 decided on 12.09.2025***. Mere movement of file from one desk/office to another is not an acceptable explanation for such a long delay.

6. In view of the above discussions/observations, the application for condonation of delay is **rejected**, consequently, the review application also stands rejected.

(Abdhesh Kumar Chaudhary,J.) (Rajan Roy,J.)

February 12, 2026

-Piyush-